DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 307 670 EA 020 922

AUTHOR Cooper, Bruce S.; Shute, R. Wayne
TITLE Training for School Management: Lessons from the American Experience. Bedford Way Papers No. 35.
INSTITUTION London Univ. (England). Inst. of Education.
REPORT NO ISBN-0-85473-307-8
PUB DATE 88
NOTE 109p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Education; *Administrator Qualifications; *Administrator Selection; *Certification; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; Instructional Leadership
IDENTIFIERS *Administrator Certification; *Great Britain

ABSTRACT

Two American academicians critically examine the American system of administrator training and certification. Suggested are key features that Britain might usefully adopt and other areas where Britain might improve on the inflexibilities of United States' policies. This book suggests mandatory certification as a central part of the process. The American model for training school administrators is reviewed according to its strengths and pitfalls. The issue of certification is treated with urgency and includes a discussion of how Great Britain can get started, the policy and the process of certification, and the contents of academic programs. The final chapter presents several scenarios that offer an optimistic glimpse into the future should Britain go toward a certification system for school leaders. Appended are 103 references. (SI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION UNIVERSITY OF LONDON

ED307670

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D.J. Bayliss

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA 020 922

Training for School Management
Lessons from the American Experience

Bedford Way Papers

ISSN 0261—0078

1. 'Fifteen Thousand Hours': A Discussion
Barbara Tizard *et al.*
ISBN 0 85473 090 7

3. Issues in Music Education
Charles Plummeridge *et al.*
ISBN 0 85473 105 9

4. No Minister: A Critique of the D E S Paper 'The School Curriculum'
John White *et al.*
ISBN 0 85473 115 6

5. Publishing School Examination Results: A Discussion
Ian Plewis *et al.*
ISBN 0 85473 116 4

8. Girls and Mathematics: The Early Years
Rosie Walden and Valerie Walkerdine
ISBN 0 85473 124 5

9. Reorganisation of Secondary Education in Manchester
Dudley Fiske
ISBN 0 85473 125 3

11. The Language Monitors
Harold Rosen
ISBN 0 85473 134 2

12. Meeting Special Educational Needs: The 1981 Act and its Implications
John Welton *et al.*
ISBN 0 85473 136 9

13. Geography in Education Now
Norman Graves *et al.*
ISBN 0 85473 219 5

14. Art and Design Education: Heritage and Prospect
Anthony Dyson *et al.*
ISBN 0 85473 245 4

15. Is Teaching a Profession?
Peter Gordon (ed.)
ISBN 0 85473 220 9

16. Teaching Political Literacy
Alex Porter (ed.)
ISBN 0 85473 154 7

17. Opening Moves: Study of Children's Language Development
Margaret Meek (ed.)
ISBN 0 85473 161 X

18. Secondary School Examinations
Jo Mortimore, Peter Mortimore and Clyde Chitty
ISBN 0 85473 259 4

19. Lessons Before Midnight: Educating for Reason in Nuclear Matters
The Bishop of Salisbury *et al*
ISBN 0 85473 189 X

20. Education plc?: Headteachers

21. The Tightening Grip: Growth of Central Control of the School Curriculum
Denis Lawton
ISBN 0 85473 201 2

22. The Quality Controllers: A Critique of the White Paper 'Teaching Quality'
Frances Slater (ed.)
ISBN 0 85473 212 8

23. Education: Time for a New Act?
Richard Aldrich and Patricia Leighton
ISBN 0 85473 217 9

24. Girls and Mathematics: from Primary to Secondary Schooling
Rosie Walden and Valerie Walkerdine
ISBN 0 85473 222 5

25. Psychology and Schooling: What's the Matter?
Guy Claxton *et al.*
ISBN 0 85473 228 4

26. Sarah's Letters: A Case of Shyness
Bernard T. Harrison
ISBN 0 85473 241 1

27. The Infant School: past, present and future
Rosemary Davis (ed.)
ISBN 0 85473 250 0

28. The Politics of Health Information
Wendy Farrant and Jill Russell
ISBN 0 85473 260 8

29. The GCSE: an uncommon examination
Caroline Gipps (ed.)
ISBN 0 85473 262 4

30. Education for a Pluralist Society
Graham Haydon (ed.)
ISBN 0 85473 263 2

31. Lessons in Partnership: an INSET course as a case study
Elizabeth Cowne and Brahm Norwich
ISBN 0 85473 267 5

32. Redefining the Comprehensive Experience
Clyde Chitty (ed.)
ISBN 0 85473 280 2

33. The National Curriculum
Denis Lawton and Clyde Chitty (eds.)
ISBN 0 85473 294 2

34. Girls and Computers: general issues and case studies of Logo in the mathematics classroom
Celia Hoyles (ed.)
ISBN 0 85473 306 X

35. Training for School Management: lessons from the American experience
Bruce S. Cooper and R. Wayne Shute
ISBN 0 85473 307 8

Training for School Management

Lessons from the American Experience

Bruce S. Cooper and R. Wayne Shute

Foreword by Gareth Williams

Bedford Way Papers 35
INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
University of London

5

First published in 1988 by the Institute of Education, University of London,
20 Bedford Way, London WC1H 0AL.

Distributed by Turnaround Distribution Ltd., 27 Horsell Road,
London N5 1XL (telephone: 01-609 7836).

The opinions expressed in these papers are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the publisher.

© Institute of Education, University of London, 1988
All rights reserved.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

Cooper, Bruce S.
Training for school management: lessons from the American experience
(Bedford Way paper, ISSN 0261-0078; 33).
I. Title. II. Shute, R. Wayne. III. Series.
371.2' 00973

ISBN 0-85473-307-8

Typeset by Acies Print Ltd, Leicester
Printed in Great Britain by Billing & Sons Ltd, Worcester and London

Contents

	Page
List of Tables and Figures	vi
Note on Authors	vii
Foreword *Gareth Williams*	ix
Preface	xiv
Chapter One: Certification, the Need	1
Old Problems Writ New	1
A Comparative Perspective	7
Chapter Two: Certification, the American Experience	11
The American Model:	
1. A Standard Programme for Standard Credits	13
2. University Designation	27
3. Access to Training and Administrative Positions	33
Summary	37
Chapter Three: Certification, the Time is Right in Britain	38
1. Why Now?	39
2. How to Get Started	43
3. The Policy and the Process	46
4. The Academic Programmes	51
Chapter Four: Certification, the Future	70
Scenario	73
Stage 1: 'Certification is Suggested'	73
Stage 2: 'Circular 3/89 is issued'	75
Stage 3: Candidate Jones	76
Stage 4: a Primary School Case	78
Conclusion	79
References	81

Tables and Figures

Table 1:	Education Managers in Educational Institutions in the UK	6
Table 2:	The Evolution of Training in School Administration	15
Table 3:	Typical Course of Study for State Licensing of School Administrators in the New York State, 1988	23
Table 4:	Timetable for Establishing Certification Requirements	48
Table 5:	Full-Time Masters Course in Education Administration	51
Table 6:	Licensing Process Using a Mixed-Modular Approach	52
Table 7:	Superintendents' Ranking of Issues and Challenges Facing the Superintendency, 1982	64
Figure 1:	Steps of the School Management Ladder and Requirements in the US	34

Note on Authors

Bruce S. Cooper is Associate Professor in the Department of Educational Administration, Policy and Urban Education at Fordham University School of Education, New York City.

R. Wayne Shute is Professor of Educational Leadership at Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah.

Gareth Williams is Professor of Educational Administration at the Institute of Education, University of London.

Foreword

Gareth Williams

The daily life of English headteachers in the 1990s will be very different from that of their predecessors a generation earlier. Authority of heads to decide what is taught in school will be very much diminished while responsibility for the school's finances will be very much increased.

Most of the literature on headship during the quarter century following the 1944 Education Act makes much of the role of the head as the leading professional in the school. Certainly, being the head of a secondary school or even head of a large department would take a teacher out of the classroom for much of the working day. However, most headteachers felt it important to be seen in the classroom from time to time and in the staff room frequently — as an example and morale booster both to pupils and to teachers. In most primary schools, of course, headteachers still continue to have a significant teaching role. The very name 'headteacher', which nowadays tends to be used in preference to the previous designation 'headmaster' and 'headmistress', for obvious reasons, implies a senior teacher rather than a manager, or a mere administrator.

In the United States it has long been very different. Schools have principals not headteachers. In career terms, the school principal is on a middle rung of an administrative ladder which would have been chosen early in the individual's career and which may lead to broader administrative responsibilities for a range of schools under the central School Board. The American school principal will almost certainly have a master's degree in Educational Administration and is legally required to have an administrator's certificate issued by the state education department as well. Career advancement will have depended more upon acquisition of these qualifications and state-granted licenses than on performance as a classroom teacher. American teachers must decide early on in their careers whether they wish to follow a managerial or a teaching career.

Of course, the role of the school head has not been static in the past. The tasks and functions of English headteachers during the period since 1944 can be divided into five main phases.

The end of the first, paternalistic, stage of headship came with the appearance in the late 1950s and 1960s of the larger comprehensive secondary school. Running a large school of a thousand or more pupils is clearly a different matter from being head of a school of two or three hundred. It is no longer possible to know all pupils and their families individually. Indeed, in large schools some heads are reputed to find it difficult to know all the teachers personally. Formal management structures and information systems must, in large part, replace informal staff room conversations. Many of the powers and responsibilities that the head of a small school enjoys must be delegated to deputies or functional heads in larger establishments. However, provided that resources are reasonably adequate and, in large part, controlled from outside, the head of even a large school is able to remain primarily an educationist. Interactions with other teachers will be mainly about educational matters, making appointments, organizing curriculum, and advising on career development.

The third stage in the decline and fall of the traditional, charismatic, English headteacher can be dated from the mid-1970s when the fall in the birth-rate began to have a serious effect on schools. For the first time English state schools had to try to 'attract' pupils rather than select or, at worst, merely accept them. Headteachers were expected to add to their range of skills an aptitude for public relations and promotional activities. They had to become adept at negotiating and bargaining with local authorities in order to ensure that cuts in planned pupils numbers were avoided, or were made in other schools. They had to exhibit up-market salesmanship to parents to raise the image of their own schools and increase their market share.

The fourth stage of post-war headship began in the late 1970s when resource stringency was added to falling pupil numbers as the main challenge confronting headteachers. Good husbandry was added to the skills which a successful head needed to have. The most important effect of financial stringency, coming on top of falling school rolls, was its effect on teachers' careers and morale. By the middle of the 1980s, personnel management and industrial relations were major preoccupations of most headteachers. The task was complicated by more explicit involvement of local politicians in school affairs in some local authorities. Entrepreneurship was added in the mid-1980s when an increasing proportion of the 'extras' that schools enjoy had to be paid for with outside funds. Headteachers are now devoting most of their time to activities that are not directly educational.

Now we have the great Education Reform Act of 1988 and the fifth phase is about to begin. Much of the curriculum responsibility of heads will be taken away and guidelines about the implementation of the national curriculum will be issued from government agencies. Fundamental debate about the educational value of different curricula will take place outside, not within, schools. Heads will become managers of an imposed curriculum rather than partners in curriculum development. However, at the same time schools and their heads are to be given much more financial autonomy, and they will have to consider economic issues such as the most effective and efficient ways to deliver a given curriculum. Financial skills such as drawing up budgets, control of budgets and management information systems will loom large in the day-to-day life of headteachers and their senior colleagues as the Education Reform Act is implemented.

There is no *a priori* reason for supposing that schools as educational institutions will be better or worse as a result of these changes, nor that the task of being a headteacher will be any more or less challenging. It will, however, certainly be *different*, and the change of working life-style involved in moving from classroom teacher to becoming head of department or headteacher will be very much greater. The assumption that those who are good teachers will automatically become good heads will be even more dangerous than it has been in the past. Both the selection of headteachers, and the training given to them and others in senior management positions, will need to be far more carefully planned and more systematically structured than has been the case up to now.

What form this selection and training should take is very much a matter for debate. Should we follow the American example of developing an administrative route as one of the career paths which teachers adopt relatively early on, so that school management is a separate profession with separate credentials? (see Cuban, 1988.) One possibility is the model of the Merchant Navy, where officers acquire qualifications during the course of their careers which give them Second Mate's Certificate, First Mate's Certificate and finally a Master's Certificate. Possession of the appropriate certificate is a necessary but not a sufficient condition for becoming Captain of a ship.

A very different model was adopted in the British education service in 1981, with the one-term training courses and the 20-day training courses. These allowed headteachers to be selected in the traditional, rather haphazard, way but provided the opportunity for them to have formal training alongside others in a similar position after they had been appointed. There was, however, very little guidance to providers of courses as to what the content of the training should be. Between 1981 and 1987, large numbers

of headteachers and their deputies obtained some management training but they had little assurance that what they did in one course corresponded to what their colleagues were doing somewhere else in the country.

Present trends in Grant-Related In-Service Training (GRIST) are likely to encourage an approach to headteacher training that concentrates on techniques and tools of the trade. There will, undoubtedly, during the next few years be innumerable courses on drawing up budgets, interpreting accounts, using computer spreadsheets, conducting appraisal interviews, understanding the MSC, and so on. The question which a responsible teacher education institution must ask is whether this will be enough. Undoubtedly, headteachers will need to understand budgets, personnel management, the relations between schools and the community, and so on. But running a school is surely more than having a lot of technical skills. As a minimum there would be considerable value if teachers were able to accumulate credits from such short courses and supplement them with some short periods of more academic work and a substantial written assignment to obtain qualifications at master's degree level. It is probably true that many of the courses provided in educational administration in this country in the past have been grounded much too much in sociological and political theory and not enough in the day-to-day life of the people running schools and colleges. However, it is equally true that those who run schools effectively need to *understand* what they are doing as well as *know how* to do it. Some school specific training must be on-the-job, but considerable benefits also derive from wider ranging courses where heads can learn some of the underlying principles and meet colleagues from other schools and other local authorities where the specific problems and management techniques may be different.

The challenges facing Government, local authorities and educational management providers are truly daunting. Amongst providers, the present climate encourages competition and survival of the fittest. It is not clear, however, that the fragmentation and wide variety of approaches which this encourages will in the long run be any more healthy for the education system than staff college orthodoxy. On the other hand, the single 'staff college' approach may result in one recognized approach to headship which risks laying the dead hand of a single orthodoxy on all our schools.

In this Bedford Way Paper, Bruce Cooper, Associate Professor in the Department of Educational Administration, Policy and Urban Education at Fordham University School of Education, New York, and Wayne Shute, Professor of Educational Leadership, at Brigham Young University have performed a valuable service to British educational administrators and policy-makers with a critical examination of the American system of headteacher

preparation and suggesting which features of it we, in Britain might adopt, which we should adapt and which we should avoid at all cost.

Mindless accumulation of course credits is unlikely to commend itself either to policy-makers or to academics in this country. However, we have reached the stage in Britain where being a headteacher or head of department is so different from being a classroom teacher that systematic provision of some form of separate training and certification is essential for the well-being of our schools and the efficient use of resources within them.

G. W.
Institute of Education
University of London
July, 1988

Preface

We both came to the Institute of Education, University of London, in 1987 as scholars on sabbatical leave from the United States, Bruce Cooper for sixteen months, Wayne Shute for five months. We have found it a most stimulating and supportive place, where it is possible to meet other scholars, and to watch and learn about changes in British education. We brought with us a perspective on the preparation of school senior staff forged in the United States where we both teach and train school administrators.

Thus, when the kind people at the Bedford Way Papers asked if we might leave behind our suggestions about how better to prepare school heads, advisors, inspectors and officers in Britain, we conceived of this book. It is meant as sympathetic advice, not criticism, since much is wrong with the American approach, as is explained in Chapter Two. As outsiders we felt encouraged to speak candidly, even at times the unspeakable, and obviously what we have said could be dismissed as naive or uninformed. We hope for more than that, however, since our best thinking about the problems of education in Great Britain (and in America) is represented here.

We acknowledge the support and help of many colleagues and friends. First, we appreciate the time and effort of those in the Department of Economic, Administrative, and Policy Studies in Education (DEAPSIE) at the Institute; its chair and professor, Gareth Williams, has been a colleague, friend, supporter and critic during our stay. He, in fact, suggested that this essay might be expanded and elaborated for a Bedford Way Paper, and kindly consented to write the Foreword.

In DEAPSIE, Dr Pamela Young has been a staunch helper and critic, giving the paper a careful, thoughtful reading and making many useful suggestions which we have used. Dr John Sayer, an experienced head with a great style and wit, gave a very useful first read, and suggested that we needed to go farther and deeper, more than doubling our original length.

Thanks also to Maureen Woodhall, Rene Saran, William Birch, Bill Foster, Chaim Gaziel, Cari Loder, John Welton, D. A. Howell, Frances Tipton, John Mace, Basil Bernstein, Tony Green, John White, and others who were such good colleagues during this period of our lives.

Second, at the Institute of Education, which has just received its Royal Charter, we have much appreciated the kindness and patience of Professor Denis Lawton, the Director, in attending to the requests of two Americans. He was a gracious host, and made his office available to us for visiting colleagues from the United States. Denis Baylis, the Information and Publications Officer, too, has been a guiding light in putting this book together.

Others in Britain have shared their time so graciously. The Secretary of State for Education, the Rt. Hon. Kenneth Baker, MP, was kind enough to express an interest in our writing. Stuart Sexton has been a helpful supporter, as have Dennis O'Keeffe, Baroness Caroline Cox and John Marks. We thank also our friend, Ray Bolam, and his staff at the National Development Centre for School Management Training for their insight and support.

We should like also to mention our families, who always play a key role in supporting writers at work. Bruce thanks the Cooper clan: Nancy, Phoebe, Jessie and Shoshi; Wayne appreciates the help of the Shutes: Lorna, Christian, Jonathan, Nancy, Leslie, Gordon, Marianne, Jennifer, Sara and Kimball. Though of course the paper is ours, for which we accept responsibility, we do appreciate the gracious help from our friends.

Bruce Cooper
Wayne Shute
June, 1988

Chapter One
Certification
The Need

> That there is a need of such training cannot be denied. Since the end of the second world war, the rate of education innovation has accelerated year by year, and the demands on the management skills of school leaders has increased commensurately. (Poster, 1987, p.38)

Old problems writ new

The training and certification of school administrators in British primary and secondary education is a controversial topic, open for debate. While most people would agree that school heads, deputy heads, senior school staff, and authority directors need formal preparation for their jobs, not everyone would go along with the contention that certification is the best way to ensure adequate training and quality. As Ron Glatter asserted some fifteen years ago, 'lying just beneath the surface is the issue of whether training should lead to formal certification' (Glatter, 1972, p.1).

The time is right for a debate on the issue in Great Britain. Discussions began in earnest in the 1960s with the comprehensive reorganization of schools and now intensify as the Government proposes what might be called the 'devolution revolution', with a major leadership role for school senior staff and governors in determining their own budgets, personnel, and programmes. In the mid-1960s, the Labour Government sought to merge the smaller grammar and secondary modern schools into larger and more complex multi-purpose organizations. This restructuring required that school heads and their senior staff be able not only to manage the curriculum and students, but also to work closely with an enlarged 'management team' within schools.

As Neil Adams, headteacher of the John Taylor High School in Staffordshire, explains:

> In recent years there has been a growing realization that good management of schools does not happen without training. The awareness of our deficiencies in this respect was heightened by the introduction of large comprehensive schools and the increasing complexity of running any school, whatever its size or type. (Adams, 1987, p.1)

Coombs, among others, has argued that comprehensive schools 'must have leadership and direction, supervision and co-ordination, constant evaluation and adjustment' (Coombs, 1968, pp.119-120), a far cry from the early twentieth-century headteacher as lone 'scholar-autocrat', even called 'an autocrat of autocrats' by one observer (Baron, 1975; see also Lyons, 1974; Hughes, 1975). The 'good' old days when heads held positions of 'absolute power, . . . of authority and influence far surpassing all that is exercised by those of the same rank in other countries' (Baron, 1975; see also Hall, Mackay and Morgan, 1986) were disappearing as society became more democratic and pluralist and schools took on corporate functions requiring team management and executive-style co-operation. Formal training — often to overcome the image of heads as solitary, all-powerful operatives — increased exponentially in the late 1960s and 1970s in response to the demand for new skills and orientations. Yet Britain stopped short of requiring certification and remained one of the last major Western nations still to allow promotion to senior staff posts without stipulations about training and licensing.

Recent school reforms, embodied in the Education Reform Act of 1988, redouble the need for adequate preparation and make, in our opinion, the requirement for certification a live issue. For example, the Act will allow schools in the public sector to 'opt out', of the control of their local education authorities (LEAs) and to become grant maintained, funded directly by central government. Under such circumstances, school managers, working with their boards of governors and parents, will be expected to perform many of the administrative tasks now provided by the officers of the LEA: drawing up and controlling budgets, recruiting and assigning students, locating staff, managing the curriculum and determining programmes.

In fact, the very purpose of 'opting out', as well as devolution to the school site for schools remaining in the LEA, is to enable heads and their management team to take on greater control. The goals of leaving the system, enhancing the autonomy of school senior staff, governors, and parents, are captured in a number of recent documents. For example, in *Our Schools: a radical policy*, Stuart Sexton explains the purpose of devolution to the schools as follows:

> if the system itself were changed to one of *self-governing, self-managing, budget centres*, which were obliged, for their very survival to respond to the 'market', then there would be a built-in mechanism to raise standards and change forms and types of education in accordance with market demands. (Sexton, 1987, p.9, our italic)

The Government's consultation paper on opting out explains the purpose of the action as 'to increase the autonomy of schools and their responsiveness to parental wishes' (DES, 1987a, p.1). To make schools more autonomous, and to give more discretion to governors and senior staff, a second consultation document, on financial delegation, states that the proposed new law has two purposes:

> (a) to ensure that parents and the community know on what basis the available resources are distributed in their area and how much is being spent on each school; (b) to give the governors . . . freedom to take expenditure decisions which match their own priorities, and the guarantee that their own school will benefit if they achieve efficiency savings. (DES, 1987b, p.1)

And the Government appears to realize the need for training, though certification is still 'lying beneath the surface'. The consultation document on financial delegation states:

> The Secretary of State proposes that LEAs should be required, in accordance with the provision of the 1986 Act, to give appropriate training to governors and headteachers. The Department will discuss with interested parties how this training might best encompass training on financial management . . . and give detailed advice to LEAs, governors and headteachers on schemes of financial delegation, including appropriate management and financial information systems. (DES, 1987b, p.7)

The recognition by Government since 1964, by educators, and by university scholars, of the importance of adequate training for school administrators, therefore, has been hastened by the reforms of both Labour and Conservative Governments. Whether schools are enlarged and made more comprehensive under a Labour Government, or decentralized and made more autonomous under the Tories, the need for preparation remains. Further, the so-called 'effective schools movement' in both the United States and Great Britain — a reaction to perceptions of falling quality and declining educational results — has also fixed on the headteacher and school-based management staff the crucial responsibilities for school improvement.

In Britain, Prime Minister Callaghan's Ruskin College speech of October 1976 is indentified as a turning point. It 'invited', according to Hall et al. (1986), 'the question of what constitutes school success or effectiveness'

(p.5). Then, *Ten Good Schools: A Secondary School Enquiry* (DES, 1975), a much-read publication from Her Majesty's Inspectors (HMI), again asserted that successful schools had good headteachers and senior staff. From the Government's perspective, effective schools share certain qualities. The HMI book noted about good schools: 'What they all have in common is effective leadership and a "climate" that is conducive to growth . . . Emphasis is laid on consultation, team work and participation, but without exception, *the most important single factor in the success of these schools is the quality of leadership of the head*' (DES, 1975, p.36). Again, the issue of training appears as the need for good leadership in schools is asserted.

In this book, we shall go a step further. We shall argue that training and certification requirements must go hand in hand: that unless government (local and national) and professional associations somehow mandate that school heads, deputy heads, chairs, inspectors, directors, and other senior authority administrators be formally trained *and* licensed for their jobs, then the nation cannot hope to see its school leaders adequately prepared to run their schools effectively. Everard, in his study *Developing Management in Schools* (1986), comments that 'it is difficult not to be disturbed by the low level of training to which the majority of those in managerial positions had been exposed — in terms of both quantity and quality' (p.69). Furthermore, he notes the absence of 'any underlying *strategy* for accomplishing this development' (ibid.), evidence of the lack of public will and interest in getting school administrators well-prepared for the challenge of improving education in Britain.

What we propose is the certification by an official body of the preparation and credentials of senior school staff, testifying to the qualifications of those who lead the schools of Great Britain. We shall also propose later that the official body be a Society of School Administrators (SSA) with a School Administrator Accreditation Board working under the Society's direction. In the United States, Canada, and Australia, for example, certification comes from the state or provincial department of education, which oversees the process. In Britain at the present time, preparation ranges from no formal training and study at all, through brief short courses at university and occasional in-service programmes, usually run by local education authorities, to full-scale, residential graduate programmes requiring that candidates take time off from their work and attend classes, and which lead to a master's degree.

Even with a master's degree or diploma in educational administration, candidates do not have the security of actually receiving a certificate for their efforts. While the record shows that indeed they have received the

training, hiring agencies might appreciate having some standard indicator of a candidate's qualifications; and training agencies (universities, LEAs) would likely want to see that their offerings fitted into a national pattern of certification. As it now stands, the training efforts are a hotchpotch of one-day, one-week, short-term, or year-long programmes which hardly fit together into a coherent testimony to the preparation of school heads, officers, and other senior school staff.

Certification itself does not ensure quality; but the certificate is a starting point in getting everyone trained and keeping track of what preparation is received. Thus, until some licensing requirement is laid down, school administrators will continue to receive piecemeal training (if any) and Britain will remain about the only major Western nation to have educators appointed to leadership positions without systematic training and certification (Glatter, 1972; Hegarty, 1983; Pennington and Bell, 1983; Weindling and Earley, 1987). Exact data on how many senior staff in schools have been trained and to what level are not available, though Squire (1987) estimated some 150 different courses are available in the United Kingdom. We know that there is great demand among trainees, as various universities, management consulting groups, LEAs, and others struggle to provide training (ibid., ch.5). The best estimate by various authorities is that there are about 150,000 senior school staff in British schools and colleges, as shown in Table 1; that about 5,500 of them did receive formal training during the One Term Training Opportunity (OTTO) and 20-day courses; and that a few others have received some training, though the numbers are now declining.

We also know that the current system, to be discussed in the next chapter, has actually led to a slight drop in the number of candidates able to receive training. Whereas in years past, government funds were available to second trainees from their schools into universities for courses, now much of this money is remaining in the local education authorities, which have attempted to run their own in-service workshops. Thus, many administrators-in-training are not able to leave their jobs for a year to gain a real academic experience in school management and administration.

Everard found, too, that even where there was a will to train administrators, there was a shortage of funds to release staff for courses. He continues:

> LEA money to pay course fees was often very tight; where teachers were prepared to pay for their own fees, they were often put off by the seemingly high costs (though, in fact, many school management courses are very reasonably priced compared with those aimed at commerce and industry). Neither heads nor INSET tutors are properly equipped to marry horses to courses (tutors feel threatened

by this), without some grounding in management and training, it is difficult to conceptualize what sort of course would suit a particular need. Thus the choice of course becomes a very hit-and-miss affair. (Everard, 1986, pp.73-74)

Table 1: Education managers in educational institutions in the UK

Type of establishment	*Post held by education manager*	*Number*
Nursery schools	Heads	1,236
Primary schools	Heads	26,764
	Deputy heads	26,764
Secondary schools	Heads	5,571
	Deputy heads	5,571
	HODs (at 10 per school)	55,710
Special schools	Heads	2,016
	Deputy heads	2,016
Non-maintained schools	Heads	2,654
	Deputy heads	2,654
Universities	Vice-chancellors or principals	46
	HODs	920
	Administrative managers (at 10 per establishment)	460
Polytechnics and other major establishments, vocational, further education colleges and colleges of education (public sector) and assisted	Directors, principals, etc.	808
	Deputy directors, etc.	808
	HODs	4,665
	Administrative managers (at 5 per establishment)	4,040
Adult education centres	Heads	4,926
	Total	147,629

Notes: Table derived from *Education Statistics for the United Kingdom. The Education Authorities' Directory* yields an average of 25 departments per Polytechnic and an average of 5.4 departments per other major further education establishment. However, the lower factor of 5 has been used in the computation after Willet who found that 50 West Midlands colleges have a total of 213 HODs.

Without a concerted national effort toward the training of administrators that leads to certification, there appears little chance of meeting these demands in a systematic fashion. Resources must be available and, most importantly, a national strategy must be created. That is one of our purposes in this book. Thus, we shall advocate the following:

1. That formal training be required of all *newly appointed administrators* by, say, the year 1993, putting candidates on notice that if they expect to be promoted to a position of head teacher, deputy head, inspector, or director, they must gain the formal training, experience, and the formal certificate before that date.

2. That a professional development plan be required for each serving administrator (those already in their administrative posts) by the year 1991, with the full expectation that these school leaders will also acquire the in-service retraining towards a certificate in the future.

3. That universities, government, school authorities, industry, and professional associations of school administrators co-operate in setting up the training experiences, in order to assure candidates-in-training that they will be able to procure the necessary courses, experiences, and skills to obtain the certificate.

4. That the Government, working closely with the professional educator groups, establish a Society of School Administrators to oversee the training programmes, to set the standards, to review candidates, and to issue the certificates, much as the Department of Education and Science now maintains the teacher certification process in Britain. That there be established under the direction of this Society, a School Administrator Accreditation Board to review the training courses — their content, activities, standards — working closely with scholars and practitioners in the field of education administration, school organization, systems research, and performance indicators.

A comparative perspective

The certification of school administrators has been common practice in many Western nations for decades. Much can be learned by comparison with the process and content of training/certifying courses in the United States, which has recently been critical of how candidates become certified — not so much of certification itself. Thus, this book will present the case for certification, and will build upon the American experience, learning from its strengths and shortcomings — we shall not simply recommend an uncritical adoption of American practices. After examining nearly fifty years of experience with

licensing school administrators in many states, we have evolved a critique of its strengths and problems. In an earlier essay (1987, 1988) Cooper and Boyd have called the American training approach the 'one best model' since it has established a regulated profession in the 50 states (though each jurisdiction sets its own requirements and issues its own licenses) with a common set of characteristics. While states may vary as to exactly how many *credit hours* are required, how many *levels* of licences (headteachers, supervisors, eduction officer — sometimes divided between school-based and central office-based) are available, how many years of previous teaching *experience* are required before one can apply for an administrator's license — (usually from three to five years as a licensed teacher), there is a growing commonality about the process and the content of training programmes.

So while Britain may suffer from the lack of a set route to senior staff positions, from a number of administrators who reach posts without any (or adequate) training, and a continuation of the 'happy amateur' mentality, the United States errs in the other direction: too much rigidity; a closed, lock-step ladder to administrative promotion; a near monopoly by the states and their training designees, the universities, in the preparation; and often the lack of high standards. In this book we shall look at each country in the light of the others: the U.S. experience of certification will be contrasted with the chaos of Britain, but the light of British unorthodoxy will be shed on the rigidified American route to leadership in education.

This first chapter, has drawn attention to the need for training and certification as a result of (1) the creation of larger, more complex schools; (2) the Government's proposals to decentralize the system, devolving more responsibilities to school staff; and (3) research on 'effective schools' which points out the importance of good school leadership. Chapter Two will present the American 'one best model' that requires all administrators in education to be 'licensed' (and often to return for up-grading and re-licensing as they ascend the career ladder). Chapter Three will describe how this certification process might be applied to Britain. It will examine the necessary steps to certification, with suggestions for improving on the American 'one best model'. Chapter Three will also take a hard look at the *content* of the certification programmes, the training courses and experiences themselves. Again, the American training effort has reached a kind of orthodoxy, one based on the behavioural sciences model for conceptualizing and teaching school management. In this chapter, we shall review the case for basing administrative practices on a common set of theories from the social sciences. Critics in the United States, Australia, and Britain, have attacked the training

content for being too narrow, formalist, and 'positivistic' (the industrial management model) at the cost of more human, dynamic, and real-life approaches. Beginning with the dichotomy of theory/practice (also called 'theory into practice'), we shall make some positive recommendations concerning the need for a more applied, comprehensive training paradigm which matches the nature of schools as human organizations.

Chapter Four will summarize the problem, and our proposal for formal certification, based on a new mode of preparation. We shall also discuss the next steps, including the setting up of a national inquiry into preparation for school management; the establishment of a certification board (preferably separate from the Department of Education and Science), that will represent the interests of educational administration, business, government, and the 'public'; the mustering of resources in schools, LEAs, universities, business; and the effective training of those seeking to lead the nation's schools.

Clearly, the next few years will be critical for British schools. Continued economic growth, the ability of the nation to adjust to life in the European and world communities, and the chances for young people to take their place in society and the work-force, all depend in part upon British schools. Much of the responsibiity falls upon the leadership of education. In his *The Philosophy of Leadership* (1983), Hodgkinson explains the vital role played by educators. He writes of the importance of vision for conceptualizing leadership and science in managing the schools. Perhaps, the most important ability is that of being able to switch from conceptualizer to active manager:

> This phase is critical and involves, metaphorically, a shifting of gears from the administrative philosophy [planning, politics] into the managerial phase [mobilizing, monitoring, managing]. This phase is an intermediate one of the art between the philosophy of policy-making on the one hand and the science of management on the other; it is here where, if at all, the pieces are put together and philosophy is moved from the realm of facts, action, and *things*. (in Hoyle, 1986, pp.103-104)

Yet, if school administrators are to take on this task, we shall argue they not only need appropriate training, but they also require some professional goals themselves — certification being a good one. It would bring these managers into the community of leaders from other professional fields, from business, medicine, law, social services, and government. Certification is likely to lead to a widening of concern for school effectiveness, productivity, and education improvement.

Ironically, the educational service in Britain may be among the last

institutions to give serious attention to the training of its managers. As Poster explains:

> While British industrial management has been willing to learn from, and sometimes contribute to, transatlantic and continental management expertise, educationalists have all too often adopted a 'holier than thou' attitude, and from ignorance or perversity have cut themselves off from a whole range of skills and techniques, processes and management theory that would have contributed to school improvement. (Poster, 1987, p.37)

Even after preparation, and even after earning a degree in school management from a university, candidates for administrative positions have no agency to accredit their preparation, qualifications, and skills. While most of the industrialized world demands that their nation's school administrators study their craft at a university, amass credits toward a degree or diploma in school management, and receive a government-granted certificate, Britain stands virtually alone in making such training largely voluntary and providing no means for certification. This isolation must end.

Chapter Two

Certification
The American Experience

> Today's developed society . . . depends for leadership on the managers of its major institutions. It depends on their knowledge, on their vision, and on their responsibility. In this society, management — its tasks, its responsibilities, its practices — is central: as a need, as an essential contribution, and as a subject of study. (Drucker, 1973)

The United States is an informative case in point. The training and certification of school administrators has there reached full maturity over the last century, and thus presents a useful case for comparision with the less-developed approaches to preparation in Britain. In fact, an orthodoxy — a set means for gaining admission to the profession of school administrator — is now so well established in the United States that we can speak of the 'one best model' of training and licensing (Cooper and Boyd, 1987).

This model has several characteristics. First, it is based on students' (administrators-in-training) receiving appropriate credit courses, taught in certain sequences, and by university instructors with training in such areas as school management sciences, school law, school finance, or labour relations. Second, all training for licensure must occur at designated universities, under the careful supervision of the state departments of education. Third, access to certification is closed to those who have not been previously licensed and experienced as teachers. And without a licence, an individual may not be hired to an administrative post in a state-run (or 'public') school.

For nearly a half-century, then, school administrators have been required to obtain a license based on three main criteria:

(1) Satisfactory experience as a teacher prior to applying for additional management training;

(2) Satisfactory completion of a course of study at a university graduate

programme in school administration, leading to the accumulation of requisite university credits; and,
(3) Satisfactory completion of an internship or 'practicum' working in a school or school district office.

With these stipulations met, a candidate for a certificate in educational administration may apply to the state department of education for a review and then for the granting of a licence to practise administration in a government school (private school administrators do not have to be licensed in most jurisdictions). In many states, this licence must be 'renewed' every few years, by the taking of additional classes in administration and supervision. Also, should the administrator change jobs, moving, say, from a school-level job (a headship) to a 'central office' (LEA) post, such as superintendent of schools (the American equivalent of Chief Education Officer), then in many states additional study is also required and the upgrading of the certificate. These requirements usually measure out in 'credit hours', much as in any undergraduate course of study, which are registered with an office of certification in the state department of education.

The model is a 'professional-service' approach, often seen in fields such as medicine, law and accountancy. Without a licence, for example, it is illegal to practise the profession, just as it would be against the law for doctors to treat clients without official approval of their medical qualifications, training, and skills, by some agency, preferably, a group controlled by the profession itself but one which works closely with government. Thus, in the United States, as well as in Australia, Canada, Israel and other nations, the practice of certification is well established. It should be noted, however, that the idea of certification is not without its critics. The criticisms, as we note later in this chapter, usually focus on the inability of schools of education (which have a monopoly of the training of administrators) to widen their scope of training to include a vast array of possible offerings in other parts of the university or beyond into such fields as business or government.

A second criticism focuses on the outcome of certification. Fallows argues that when an organization 'regulates its own competition', it soon begins to measure professional competence by 'inputs' rather than by 'outputs'. He cites cases of the military, civil service, government aid programmes, even professional groups (law, business, etc.) which he believes put a lid on excellence. He adds:

> Despite all the pious encomiums that risk-takers now receive, few people seek risk when they can rely on a sure thing. To a degree only dreamed of by Mark Twain's river pilots, the professions now represent America's surest thing . . .

> Thus meritocracy [certification] can corrupt its professionals, making them care more about keeping what they have than creating something new. (Fallows, 1985, p.49)

Fallows goes on to say that the academic credentialing which has evolved over the past century is deficient by its own most basic standard, that of guaranteeing high performance. 'At every step of the way what is rewarded is excellence in school, which is related to excellence on the job only indirectly and sometimes not at all' (ibid., p.64).

A third criticism relates to the matter of obsolescence. Once professionals are certified and fail to see the need for on-going training, they could easily atrophy, hide behind the certification, and fail to keep up with the state-of-the-art knowledge necessary for excellence.

Despite these criticisms, we think that the advantages of licensing can greatly outweigh the disadvantages if the process is carefully developed and the disadvantages addressed. Thus, in this chapter, we shall explain the process of licensing, based on the American model. Then, using the research of Cooper and Boyd (1987), we shall discuss ways of improving the certification procedures, so that Britain might benefit from the experience of the United States.

The model of training administrators for schools in the United States has evolved over many decades, as states have worked to expand their certification procedures. Each of the fifty states has its own school administrator's licence, with its own set of requirements, though many states now have reciprocity arrangements for exchanging administrators amongst jurisdictions. However, a model training process has emerged, which will be informative for Britain, and which has the following characteristics.

The American model:

1. A standard programme for standard credits

In Britain, school senior staff may be appointed without completing a specific preparation programme and, furthermore, no standard course of study exists for training and accrediting the course of study, other than the set university master's degree, diploma, and doctoral studies Each university, LEA, polytechnic, consulting firm, therefore, may and does offer a range of short courses of a day, a week, 20 days, OTTO courses (One-Term Training Opportunity), and universities provide year-long, full-time master's degree programmes, two-year part-time Master of Arts, and Master of Philosophy and Doctor of Philosophy.

If a licensing system is to be installed in Britain, then some minimum level of training, of a certain type, will be required. Again, the American case is useful, for it illustrates the close relationship between the changing role of the school administrator (headteacher and superintendent in particular) and the increased need for training. In effect, as schools became larger, and more complex social systems, the paradigms for explaining the managers' roles likewise became more intricate and the required training more extensive.

A direct relationship evolved between the school leadership function and formal training and certification. Thus, it is important to trace the stages in the development of school administration in the United States (and, by implication, in Britain) from 1865 to 1988, including the manager's role and titles, the background which these leaders brought to the posts, their philosophy as leaders, their formal training, if any, and the course credits, degrees and licences they received, and were required to earn, before attaining their position in schools. Yet, as Cooper and Boyd (1987) explain:

> Certainly, it was not pre-ordained that the university classroom would be the site, the state the overseer, and the credit the unit. However, once the demand for administrators increased, the credentialing process began, and the complexity of American schools grew, it seemed inevitable that the standard, state-sanctioned program would take hold. (p.6)

The emergence of the 'one best model', with its set of requirements and certification, is one of the major developments in American education and one which should be informative to British educators as they look to their future needs. As shown in Table 2, school administration in the United States has gone through perhaps six stages, each with its own role, philosophy, and type of training and licensing. It is obvious from this table that preparation of school administrators has increased in formality, complexity and structure: from amateur to professional, from simple to complicated, from personal and intuitive to 'scientific'. It has developed under various rubrics: efficiency, business management, scientific management, and behavioural science.

Phase 1: Philosopher-Educator (or the 'happy amateur')

We know little about the lives and professional preparation of the early school heads in the United States and Britain. What has survived from the 1800s are mainly autobiographies, diaries, and philosophical writings, plus some

Table 2: The evolution of training in school administration

Approximate dates	*Role or title*	*Programme content background*	*Philosophy*	*Training*	*Degrees and licensure*
1865-1900	Philosopher-educator	Teacher training, no formal training in administration	Pedagogy, classics, liberal arts, philosophy	Informal, as teachers	No special degrees or licences
1900-1912	Educator-capitalist	Teacher training and experience	Business ethos, 'cult of efficiency', no administrative training	No formal training	No degrees or licences in administration
1913-1915	Business manager	Business, techniques of accounting, graphing, and some philosophy	Mix of pedagogy, philosophy, and efficiency	Beginnings of programmes in educational administration	First degrees offered, no licence required.
1915-1929	School executive	Administration based on rudiments of scientific management, business	Cult of efficiency, business methods	Formal, university based	Master's, some state licencing
1930-1950	Social agent	Social foundations, administrator as mediator	Social philosophy economics, change 'Democratic' administration	Formal, required, university based	Master's and licence
			ONE BEST MODEL		
1950-1985	Behavioural scientist	Management, organization theory, leadership theory	Behavioural, empirical	Formal, state-contolled, set credits for various licences	Master's and credits building-and-district-level licences, state run

Source: Adapted, in part, from Raymond E. Callahan and H. Warren Button, 'Historical Change of the Role of the Man in the Organization: 1865-1950', in *Behavioral Science and Educational Administration*, ed. Daniel E. Griffiths, 63rd Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964), pp.73-92. Reproduced with permission of the National Society for the Study of Education.

15

functional accounts of the schoolteacher and headmaster. Much is shrouded in myth and stereotypes based on characters of Charles Dickens and accounts of Rugby's headmaster, Thomas Arnold.

Among the reports on the state of education in the early 19th century which have survived is the testimony of the Rev William Gurney, Rector of St. Clement Danes, London. He wrote in 1816: 'We found that there were a great many who did not go to any school; the reason assigned in some measure for it was their ragged condition, and their being unfit, from their great poverty, to appear decently at any school'. By the early 20th century, books were being published in the United States by school superintendents and by early scholars about their work (see Chancellor, 1904; Dutton and Snedden, 1908; Spaulding, 1910; Bobbitt, 1913).

In all, these writings indicate that early school heads received some basic instruction in pedagogy, usually from other teachers, but no formal training to be school leaders. Men like William Torrey Harris (the St. Louis, Missouri, school superintendent and later US Commissioner of Education) and William H. Payne (writer, professor, and Michigan school superintendent) were distinguished both for their work and their writings. Payne, for example, was the leading Hegelian of his time. Theories of school management and licensure were the furthest thing from their minds. It is no wonder that the first inklings of school leadership theory during these early days was what is now called 'trait theory' and 'great man' approaches to leadership, based on the personal qualities of these early figures. These paragons of school leadership became role models for generations of school administrators to follow (for a contemporary example, see the biography of Frank Boyden, Headmaster of Deerfield Academy, by John McPhee, 1967).

Phase 2: Educator Capitalist

As the business ethos became predominant in American life, as described by the analysis of Raymond Callahan (1962) and others, school leaders too were expected to use the most modern business methods and the 'cult of efficiency' in education in the United States was born. Increased demands were placed upon the schools in the early 20th century by mass immigration. School administrators of this period were urged to do more, for more children, with fewer resources. In the autumn of 1910, the writings of Frederick Taylor helped to launch the 'scientific management' movement in the United States, placing greater pressure on school administrators to serve the expanding population of school-age children whilst also cutting waste, improving efficiency, and *being more like business*.

By 1913, according to accounts, many school administrators who were untrained in business management and who could not demonstrate the ability to be more efficient and businesslike were removed from office. The *American School Board Journal* in 1913 recounted the effects of the efficiency movement on school personnel:

> No recent year has seen such wholesale changes in superintendencies and high schools positions . . . there has been a perfect storm of unrest culminating in wholesale resignations, dismissals and new appointments. (Callahan and Button, 1964, p.43)

School administrators had no training in business methods, finance or efficiency and they paid the price. The years of playing philosopher-educator were mostly over: the public was demanding that schools be larger, more efficient, and better, for less money (the period 1900-1913 was one of high inflation). And the meagre training as a teacher hardly qualified school officers and heads for the responsibilities of their newly-defined posts. Even secondary school principals found that they were responsible in the American cities not only for their own buildings but often too for the 'feeder' primary schools in their communities. Demand increased for the training of managers, though no credentials were yet required.

Much of this early debate in the United States may sound familiar to contemporary Britain, as the business community continues to put pressure on schools to be more effective, to achieve greater productivity, and to be accountable; and the Government plans to devolve more responsibility to the school senior staff. The era of the 'league table', the benchmark and the active manager comes at a time when many school heads do not feel prepared for these new responsibilities. It has already sparked a demand for new and better training, and now possibly for certification.

Phase 3: Business Manager

For those leaders who were able to survive the early 20th century in American schools, the message was clear: learn business methods or 'die'. Frank E. Spaulding, school superintendent in Newton, Massachusetts, advocated that schools should best be run 'on simple and sound business principles' (1910, p.3). When delivering the first major address to his fellows of the Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association, Spaulding entitled his speech 'Improving School Systems through Scientific Management' (1913), bringing together the still-relevant themes of school improvement and good management. It seems from our perspective now

that much of this 'theory' boiled down to educating more children, in larger classes, with less costs per pupil. This appealed to the businessmen on the local school boards who wished to have more pupils taught for less public tax support.

Universities, too, recognized the need to establish courses for school principals and officers which stressed good school management, economy, and efficiency. Looking to the newly established fields of scientific management, industrial psychology, and engineering, these early university teachers were quick to make the connection between the work of school managers, fiscal efficiency, and improved 'outputs'. The intellectual paradigm of the 'one best model' of training administrators had been created.

From this beginning, the universities began to teach 'management' and the states began to set requirements which included the beginnings of licensure of administrators. And to make schools more efficient, more business-like, as writers like Franklin Bobbitt and Ellwood P. Cubberley explained, the system had to control the behaviour of teachers, heads and officers. It required, as Bobbitt explained in *The Supervision of City Schools: some general principles of management applied to the problems of city-school systems* (1913), the 'centralization of authority and definite direction by supervisors of all processes performed' (p.1, part 7). The components of the 'one best model' were falling into place: the semblance of scientific enquiry, the language of management, the goals of efficiency, and, finally, the perceived need for centralized control and authority.

Phase 4: School Executive

As Callahan and Button (1964) have explained, the period between 1915 and 1929 was characterized by the rise of the powerful superintendents of schools. This development was supported in the universities by the establishment of several well-known departments of educational administration, headed by such giants as Cubberley (see Cubberley, 1916) at Stanford University and George Strayer (see Strayer, 1925) at Teachers College, Columbia University.

The school leaders were seen, in Cubberley's words, as 'captains of education', with nearly unlimited power to hire and fire staff, set and supervise the curriculum, and control local school boards and public opinion. These school administrators often received advanced university training, a master's degree in their field, and in many states were expected to apply for a licence. Their training was highly practical and applied; to come later was the intellectual base which was provided by the use of the 'behavioural sciences'. In the 1920s professors like Strayer at Teachers College, Columbia

University, emphasized basic techniques of graph reading, calculating, accounting, rather than elaborate theories of leadership in organizations. Business was still the model of training, not the social sciences.

Phase 5: Administrator as Social Change Agent

In the years that followed the Depression, adulation for the business ethic began somewhat to subside. Administrators and those who trained them were forced to think about wider socio-economic issues in their management training. Writers like Professor George S. Counts raised the basic question of the role of schooling in society: 'Dare the school build a new social order?' (1932), calling into question the whole enterprise (Bowers, 1969; Cremin, 1961). With millions unemployed in the Depression and the War later in full swing, the heady belief in rational and technical management was leavened by a concern for wider political issues. School leaders were expected to mediate between 'classroom learning-teaching and the purpose of function of schools' (Callahan and Button, 1964) in a wider sense.

By 1950, a majority of American school administrators were receiving advanced graduate work in school management and 38 states by then required a licence plus graduate degrees (usually a master's) in administration for superintendents and principals in public (state) schools. Training itself was still highly practical, though some discussion of the 'ends' of education had crept into the scientific management model. Missing still at many universities were academic respectability and a sense of acceptance as a full university discipline. It was with the arrival of the social science of school management — the next phase — that full status in the academy was to be extended.

Phase 6: Administrator as Behavioural Scientist

Since the 1950s, school administrators in the United States (and to a large extent in Britain as well) have been trained to be what might be called 'applied social scientists'. As such, professors of educational administration and their students (administrators-in-training) are using concepts from sociology, psychology, political science and anthropology for understanding the activities of school leaders. In the words of Daniel E. Griffiths in his classic 1964 work, *Behavioral Science and Educational Administration:* 'administration is susceptible to empirical research . . .' using '. . . concepts and theories of human behaviour, research designs, statistical insights, computers, and the logic of these modes of inquiry'. (Griffiths, 1964, p.3)

Now that there was a growing consensus among those who prepared administrators about what they should learn, the next task was to design programmes for training and to get the state government to approve them for

licensing. Thus, one important outcome of the behavioural theory movement in education administration (Crowson and McPherson, 1986) was a body of research, a method of study, and a common philosophical viewpoint (empirical, positivist, behavioural) around which to base the course offerings. If predictability could be built into the training process, then a universal set of standards could be established and a certification system organized around it. Just as medical doctors could point to their knowledge of anatomy, pharmacology, and chemistry in their practices, so, too, could school managers point to the reliability and results of the growing field of the 'management sciences' of which they were a fledgling part.

Equally important to this approach is its foundation in the scientific method: a belief in predictability, the testing of hypotheses, and the prescription of human behaviour and organizational outcomes. A home in the social sciences gave a common language to the field, a common set of assumptions, and, perhaps most importantly, a respectability to the study of school management amongst scholars and researchers. School administration took its place alongside business management, the policy sciences, and public administration. As Norman J. Boyan explains:

> The more the professor of school administration looked to the social sciences for help . . ., the more the process of administering schools appeared to be like the process of administering other organizations. The skills applicable to understanding, predicting, and controlling human behavior appeared to hold with generality in administering organizations of all kinds. (Boyan, 1981, pp.11-12)

Thus, as shown in Table 2, the road to maturity in the study of school administration holds a strong parallel to the evolution of the role of school principals and senior school officials, from philosopher-educator, through business executive and social change agent, to partnership in the community of behavioural scientists. Theory followed suit, moving from the experiences and traits of outstanding exemplars whose charisma, and vision transformed the education service in America (and likewise in Britain) to administrators of a complex social institution, requiring professional knowledge and skills.

Advantages of a standard programme

The strengths of a standard programme are many. First, as we mentioned, treating school administration as a branch of the management sciences gives the field a common language, body of knowledge, viewpoint, and empirical base. It means that professors of school management are welcomed into the fellowship of other social scientists and are published in sociological,

psychological, labour relations, policy sciences, and administrative behaviour journals. Research in administration, then, can stand upon, and contribute to, the field of social science, giving coherence to a burgeoning field (Hersey and Blanchard, 1982).

A second advantage of a standard programme in the United States is its uniformity and transferability. Licensing requirements have grown up alongside the uniform administrative positions within schools and school districts, helping to prepare candidates for set posts in school administration. Thus, within states, licences are valid for positions in any school (as, say, a head or deputy head) or districts (as officer, co-ordinator, superintendent). And, even though each state has its own particular requirements, licensing has led, by and large, to reciprocity amongst states and posts, creating a nearly universal standard across the 50 states and 15,400 school districts.

Some common characteristics across states are informative. For example, many issue a 'temporary' or 'preliminary' certificate, such as the Texas Temporary Administrative Certificate or California's Preliminary Administrative Services Credential. These certificates are valid for some three to five years, depending on the state. Often, principals (heads) and deputy heads, as well as others in middle management school positions, require only the temporary licence at initial hiring, though most states expect their senior staff to gain permanent licensure as a stipulation for continuation and promotion. Thus, superintendents need the Professional Administrative Certificate, as it is called, in the State of Utah for example.

Many states link successful administrative experience with permanent certification. Thus, where reciprocity exists, a candidate may attend a graduate training programme in one state, apply those credits toward a temporary administrative licence in another, and get a job in yet a third. After, say, three years of satisfactory service in a post, the candidate may then request permanent licensing in the state where he or she works. In Utah, for example, a candidate is 'recommended by the employing school district with input from a department of education administration' (of a university).

Thirdly, when training organizers, supported by the licensing efforts of state departments of education, came to design preparation courses, they could call upon the collective expertise of some fifty years, of research in management (starting, perhaps, with the work of Taylor, Gulick, Urwick, Roethlesburger, and picking up the more recent findings of Likert, Blau, March, Scott, Cyert, Bacharach). This theoretical development gives a coherence to the training and licensing of school managers. Thus, when one examines the role of the state in establishing the credential process for

administrators, one finds across the fifty states an amazing similarity amongst courses of study.

The course of study in most American training programmes is based upon a set of credit requirements, fulfilled by successful completion of classes in school administration approved by the state. It might be useful to look at an example, as shown in Table 3. Trainees are required to take ten different topics in administration, each which brings three credits, for a total of 30 credits. A three-credit class (we call them courses) is required, for example, in New York State, to meet for a total of 1,500 minutes of instruction, which translates into, say, 15 meetings over perhaps 15 weeks, with each session lasting 100 minutes (1 hour, 40 minutes). Or in the summers, a course (class) might meet five days per week for two weeks, with classroom work of 150 minutes per day (over 2 hours, 30 minutes, a day).

Topics are often arranged from 'introductory' to 'advanced' in a host of related areas including, as examples, Administration, Supervision, Finance, Labour Relations, Planning, Human Relations, Law, Public Policy, Personnel, the Change Process, and Organization Theory. Since each course topic stands alone as a kind of 'module', it is possible to take these requirements in almost any order over a period of years in the evenings (after work) and in the summers — enabling practising educationalists to gain the necessary credits without giving up their jobs. Furthermore, in many states, these classes can be taken at a number of different universities, subject to state approval of the courses.

Table 3 shows a sample programme of study, with the relevant data on hours, credits, and level. Each of these courses (classes) is self-contained, with examinations and papers assigned. That is, students may take any combination, at any time, though it is usually prudent to start with the lower level courses (introductory) and end with the advanced. Many universities also give a Comprehensive Examination at the conclusion of the programme, though a few now require a thesis, dissertation, or long paper for the master's course of study and licensing effort.

As part of the 30 credits (10 classes), most states also require that student-trainees receive six credits (two classes) in a field-basd practicum, or internship, to see ostensibly whether administrators-in-training can actually apply in schools what they have learned in class.

The internship is a state requirement, and is spelled out in a university course catalogue as follows:

> The internship is a six credit, two semester program, usually from September to June, designed to prepare students for certified positions at the building level,

including the principalship, and the central office, including the superintendency. To be eligible for the internship, a minimum of 12 credits in Administration and Supervision courses must have been completed with at least a B average, and the prospective intern must be free to devote a minimum of 10 clock hours a week to internship activities in a school.

The internship is a broad, systematically structured set of administrative and supervisory experiences designed and guided by a Division [of the University]faculty. The student's work experience may complement and reinforce those of the internship but not be a substitute for it. To satisfy internship requirements, the Division internship seminar [on campus] must be attended during the entire internship period. (Fordham University School of Education, N.Y.C. *Bulletin*, 1988, pp.29-30)

Table 3: Typical Course of Study for State Licensing of School Administrators in the New York State, 1988

Course Title Level/Type	*Credits*	*Time*
Introductory		
1. Fundamentals of Administration	3	1500 min.
2. Fundamentals of Supervision	3	1500 min.
Intermediate		
3. School Law, Intermediate	3	1500 min.
4. Administration of Personnel	3	1500 min.
5. Labour Relations in Education	3	1500 min.
6. Change Processes in Education	3	1500 min.
Advanced		
7. Research Seminar in Education Administration	3	1500 min.
8. Organization Theory and Design	3	1500 min.
Practicum		
9. Internship I	3	1500 min.
10. Internship II	3	1500 min.
Total Courses: 10 Total Credits: 30	Total Minutes: 15,000	

The advantages, then, of a common programme for training and licensing are many. It means that hiring groups — school districts, schools, governors — have some assurance that all candidates have had a basic course of study, have covered many of the same topics, and that the state has accredited both the courses offered and the licenses received by administrators. It means

that graduates of these programmes can speak a common language and have been exposed to similar canons of research and practice. No field of study can expect to progress without some accepted body of knowledge and theory. Improvement of schools through high quality management training becomes, then, a shared goal of universities, the state, the schools, and the candidates for leadership posts in schools.

Britain, too, has generally accepted the value of training and has drawn heavily on the management sciences (see Hughes, 1985) for background and insights. Yet the nation has stopped short of requiring formal preparation and creating a system to ensure this training through certification.

Disadvantages of a standard programme

This approach to training in the United States has also come under attack and for several reasons. First, the over-reliance on the 'management sciences' may mean that students of administration — and their professors at the university — overlook other fields of enquiry. For example, should not courses in school management also consider the humanities, philosophy, ethics, religion, and history as important areas of enquiry about the role of school leaders? Much could be learned, for example, from the titanic struggles of great figures in history and literature, though the orthodoxy in training might claim that, for instance, Hamlet's dilemmas and the leadership quandaries of Moses are not 'scientific' enough to lend themselves to formal study.

William P. Foster raises the intriguing point that administration is really a 'moral science' and deserves careful examination far beyond its technical, positivist limits. He writes:

> When administration is considered as a moral science, administrators must deal with moral dilemmas. Each decision carries moral, rather than just technical implications. This realization distinguishes the administrator from the technocrat. *Each administrative decision carries with it a restructuring of a human life;* this is why administration at its heart is the resolution of moral dilemmas. The new administrator will operate from a set of values that stresses not only research in the field but also understanding and critical inquiry. (Foster, 1986, p.33; author's italic)

Yet, the study of administration, and the way it is taught in many university courses in the United States, lays heavy emphasis on predictability, rationality, and technocratic values, at the cost of the human, moral, social, and political approaches. Administrators-in-training place a special premium on 'how to

do it better', rather than 'why do it at all?' and 'what will be the consequences of this action for others?' In its headlong rush for scientific status and respectability amongst the social science disciplines, school management has embraced perhaps the worst aspects of logical positivism — a viewpoint which argues that unless scientific knowledge is 'verifiable in principle' (ibid., p.35), it cannot be 'true'. This eliminates consideration, sometimes, of the ethical, moral values, and spiritual (charismatic, visionary) qualities of managing schools.

Secondly, even within the social science tradition, critics are charging that the teaching of school management is often of low quality: unfocused, mindless and virtually useless. In part, this lack of clear purpose is a result of the confusion within the field. Should the teaching of school administration be primarily a scientific, theory-bound process; or should it be highly applied, practical and 'useful'? This theory-versus-practice dilemma is greatly confused by the nature of management itself. Can a candidate for a job be prepared by learning general theory? or should technical skills be taught which may or may not be applicable to a particular situation and person?

In surveys of training programmes in the United States, a number of scholars have questioned the curriculum in university preparation courses. Nunnery in reporting a survey by Silver and Spuck (1978) found an alarming lack of consensus around what knowledge, theory, and practices administrators should know:

> The variance in informed opinion about what educational administrators need to know, the different preparation programme practices, and the apparent incongruities between preparation and what practitioners are spending much of their time doing, call attention to a major inadequacy in the knowledge base for educational administration. If the knowledge base is conceived of as a continuum from conventional wisdom to the results of carefully designed and conducted research, far too much of the knowledge base is near the conventional wisdom end of the continuum. (Nunnery, 1982, p.48)

Thirdly, even if programmes for the training of school administrators could arrive at a clear consensus about what should be learned and how, there is the distinct danger of obsolescence as society and schools change. Glatter talks about the 'unstable nature of the ideas-environment within which the administrator has to work' (as well as the dangers inherent in over-simplifying issues and ignoring accumulated experiences). He warns quite rightly about administrators — and those who hope to train them — getting caught up in

'swings of fashion, to which every field is subject, and education more than most' (Glatter, 1972, p.41).

In effect, formal, university-based, training programmes which purport to prepare administrators for their entire future work are likely to be doomed to failure. That society and education change, and present concepts and solutions may no longer work in the future, appears to point to the need for the life-long, integrated, collegial forms of on-going 'training' we shall discuss in the next chapter. Meanwhile, it seems absolutely vital that training programmes account for the rate of change. Albright noted the importance of training for change in Britain in his early proposals for an administrative staff college in education:

> By the time a new complex has been integrated into a workable system, it has an excellent prospect of obsolescence. Social organization fails to keep pace. Political structure becomes dysfunctional, and we grope for remedial measures. We pass laws (sanctions) that are expected to give strength to custom which is no longer sanctioned. Belief systems are porously punctured . . . The educational administrator, groping for solutions to school problems, encounters these change rates. They force a continuous re-balancing process to provide equilibrium in the school system. Thus the administrative leader faces not only the problem of change alone but the seeming counter-valences of constancy and stability that are necessary for some continuity in programme, organization, and other parts of the system. (Albright, 1962, pp.133-134)

In sum, the criticisms of the way school administrators are trained, the 'one best system' as used in the United States, appear to come from four sources:

1. That the training experiences are unrelated to what candidates need to do their jobs well, and to improve schools;

2. That the research base of training and practice is inadequate, narrow, and even inappropriate, given the practical and changing demands of the field;

3. That administrators-in-training cannot strike a useful balance between general learning (applicable to all situations) and specialised training (for particular roles as head teachers of certain schools, budget directors of school systems, labour relations experts, curriculum supervisors, and so on);

4. That the teaching of classes in school management is tedious, unchallenging, and irrelevant to the workaday world of school leaders.

The reliance on rationality and precision among administrators in university-based courses in education leadership may be appropriate to research in the laboratory, with banks of computers, oceans of resources,

and nearly unlimited time. But life in the headteacher's office is anything but calm and open-ended. Research on what heads do shows that school managers must make hundreds of decisions daily, quickly and confidently, or suffer from a bad case of 'analysis paralysis' and the collapse of the systems which they are entrusted to maintain. The science of administration may be closer to the science of muddling through (Lindblom, 1959), amid the pitch and roll of everyday life in the head's office.

Thus, training programmes must consider a set of classes on topics which are relevant and important, taught in a way that is engaging, dynamic, and challenging. In place of focusing on broad theory or case-by-case analysis, some scholars have suggested a mix of theory and practice that deals with the *principles* of good leadership, taught in a setting which combines the best of the university and the field. We shall return to these topics in the next chapter. Besides a concern for learning and knowledge (the stuff the universities trade in), it is also important to see that administrators can *perform* their roles as leaders, mediators, goal-setters, observers, supporters (see Everard, 1986, pp.69-70). Meanwhile, it seems worthwhile to require training and certification which engage the university, the trainee, the schools, and other important agencies (government, public interests), in a mutually supportive experience.

The issue is '*where* should the training take place?' In the United States, the universities hold a near monopoly and we shall turn to this topic next.

The American model:
2. University designation

In the United States, each state recognizes certain universities to provide courses in school management and administration. This recognition involves supervision by state agencies, to see that training programmes meet acceptable standards of faculty, teaching, and facilities. But the states do not fund these programmes: they only 'recognize' and 'approve' them, and students must pay their own tuition fees. When a particular university is recognized by the state, it means that courses offered there will count towards the licence (and usually a university degree or diploma as well). And thus the programmes become attractive to those seeking posts as administrators.

Since all students seeking a licence in that state must attend one of these designated institutions for courses, universities, as might be expected, strive to be included in the select group of approved training programmes. Daniel Linden Duke, former chair of the department of education administration at a private Oregon university, Lewis and Clark College, describes his efforts

to gain the privileged status of being an institution able to offer certification courses for school administrators in the state. He wrote:

> Prior to 1981 the certification of Oregon school administrators was the sole responsibility of two state universities, the University of Oregon and Portland State University. Concern over what some regarded as the complacency of these two programmes resulted in approval by the Oregon Education Co-ordinating Commission [an agency of state government] of a new educational administration programme at a private institution — Lewis and Clark College. To win approval, Lewis and Clark had to demonstrate that it would not simply duplicate existing certification programmes . . . Among the innovative features . . .:
> 1. A 'permanent' staff of part-time adjunct professors from the Portland [Oregon] school districts;
> 2. A curriculum based on a new model of instructional leadership anchored in the school effectiveness literature;
> 3. A series of field practices;
> 4. Joint degree and certification programmes with public administration and MA in teacher education;
> 5. A commitment to involve more women and minorities in school leadership;
> 6. Focus on integrating the liberal arts with advanced professional preparation. (Duke, 1987, pp.201-202)

Advantages of university designation

The role of the university graduate departments of educational administration is critical to the preparation of school administrators in the United States. Within these scholarly communities, professors of educational administration are themselves trained, conduct research, and teach the craft of school management to potential administrators prior to licensing. This academic 'culture' has developed slowly over more than a century. The first book on school administration was published in 1875 (see Payne, 1875) and the first course in the subject taught in 1879 (Campbell and Newell, 1985). It was as early as 1905 that the first two PhDs were awarded in educational administration at Teachers College, Columbia University, to Ellwood P. Cubberley and George Strayer, both of whom went on to illustrious careers as teachers, scholars and leaders in the field: Cubberley at Stanford University, Strayer at Teachers College.

By 1980, over 400 universities and colleges in the United States were allowed by their state governments to offer graduate credits toward certification in school administration. The master's programmes in administration became the most popular graduate course, granting more degrees than in any other professional field. And within the scholarly

community, professors and teachers of school management (virtually all of whom had PhDs in educational administration) became the largest contingent in the field of education. (For example, Division A, School Administration, is the largest unit of the American Educational Research Association; and introductory textbooks in school administration and management are among the biggest sellers in graduate education in the United States.)

Among the nation's institutions of higher learning which offer PhDs in school administration, over 50 have formed the University Council for Educational Administration, which publishes a journal, *Educational Administration Quarterly*, and testifies to the impulse to achieve academic weight (Crowson and McPherson, 1987; Boyan 1981). The centralizing of the training and licensing activity in the university has the advantage of creating a locus for research, communications, and a community of scholars and practitioners which would not otherwise exist without university involvement (Culbertson, 1980). The designation of universities as places for training of school managers promotes research, scholarship, mentorship and a culture of enquiry to match the development of schools of medicine and law.

In Britain, too, departments of school administration in universities and polytechnics offer courses in the field, though students (trainees) do not have to attend in order to gain a senior staff post in schools. The advantage in both countries of attending courses at a university are many. Entering the community of scholars removes school administrators from the work environment, and allows students access to libraries, scholarly enquiry, and course experiences; it provides a setting in which students can meet other practising administrators, from other local authorities, schools, and even other nations, thus encouraging a sharing of information and a place to unburden in the presence of fellow practitioners. Most importantly, the university setting is one where theories of management, schools as organizations, and research are readily available and encouraged. Time for reflection, planning, personal assessment, goal-setting, recapitulation are vital to administrators who on the job find their time dominated by constant interruptions, 'adminis-trivia', and a pressured, political environment.

As we discussed earlier, university departments of educational administration — working with such other disciplines as social psychology, sociology, organizational behaviour, political science, policy sciences, anthropology, and history of education — have evolved theories of school management and administration which have helped to conceptualize the school as a complex organization and school leadership as a social process

(Getzels and Guba, 1957; Griffiths, 1957; Gronn, 1984). They have worked to perfect strategies for training, using new techniques which include real-life simulations, case analysis, in-basket techniques (simulating the flow of memoranda, telephone messages, letters, requests for assistance which cross a headteacher's desk), as well as a tradition of internships in schools. Again, without the university setting, no such academic tradition would be possible, and administrators would have few places to turn for help in conceptualizing their jobs, their roles, and their behaviours.

Thus, it seems quite clear that the university has played a vital role in establishing educational management and administration as a field of scholarly enquiry. The size and number of university departments offering courses, the near-monopoly they enjoy, and the rise of school administration as a professional field, have all combined to make the academic component of training a central one in the credentialing process in the United States.

The disadvantages of university monopolies

School administration programmes in universities in the United States have become 'big business', with large faculties, programmes, and student groups. Working closely with the accrediting agency of the states, universities sometimes find themselves part of a 'licensing mill', rather than providing high-quality professional training; helping candidates amass the necessary academic requirements and credentials, rather than upholding high academic standards. As Peterson and Finn have described it,

> These requirements [for licensure] are nearly always stated in terms of paper credentials supplied by colleges of education — transcripts and credit hours that must parallel those on a list maintained by the certification bureau of the state education departments. (Peterson and Finn, 1985, p.44)

Thus, what started out as an intellectual, academic, and research-based effort to prepare school managers for their jobs has sometimes become a mindless process of getting students (administrator trainees) in and out of the university. Once government and universities became bed-fellows in the training effort, there was perhaps bound to be corruption of the original intent of the process. With state governments most interested in standardization, regularity, and control, paper credentials began to take the place of academic excellence; and since the survival of university departments of educational administration depended on a steady flow of paying candidates, the chance of raising standards was limited by the need for student intakes. Lay on top of that the civil service/credentializing process itself, and one

has a recipe for low quality.

Common complaints are heard: that university departments are not working closely enough with primary and secondary school personnel to improve management; that traditional (passive, lecture-discussion style) classroom teaching is sometimes inappropriate for learning the active skills of management; that graduates of programmes in educational administration lack the political and functional abilities to do well in their jobs. Candidates for management posts are taught a highly rational, scientific way of leading whereas their jobs call for 'rolling with the punches', 'shooting from the hip' and getting on with it. The disparity can induce 'analysis paralysis'. In fact, some research has found that administrators on the job make thousands of quick, small decisions every day that do not allow for the careful, studied, and intellectual approaches to management often taught in courses at graduate schools of education (Mann, 1975; Bridges, 1977).

The complaint about university monopoly is also partly political. Administrators wonder why they themselves rather than the universities do not control their own training. After all, in medicine and law, doctors and attorneys determine the training, the certification requirements and testing for admission to the profession, not the state working with the universities. Nunnery, for example, has asserted 'that no meaningful reform will occur until education administration preparation is freed from many of the traditional academic practices' (Nunnery, 1982, p.46) which include reliance on credits, classroom instruction in the university, and current course content.

In their book, *Approaches to Administrative Training in Education*, Murphy and Hallinger (1987) have edited interesting chapters on a variety of non-university settings for training administrators, including principals' (headteachers') centres, principals' academies, peer-assisted leadership, principals' collegial support groups. These experiments in administrator preparation in the United States are premised on the notion that good training can also occur away from the hallowed halls of academe; that principals and other administrators can learn much from one another, organized in networks and support groups; and that administrators must somehow control their own training, rather than having the process controlled (often for political reasons) by agencies other than themselves.

This concept of working closely with universities, but having administrators gain more control over their own training and professional development, is an important breakthrough in the United States, one which we shall discuss more extensively when we make suggestions about certification of administrators in Britain. It appears that to isolate administrators-in-training in the 'ivy halls' of the university may not be much

better than leaving them in isolation in their respective schools and offices. According to Levine and her colleagues (1987, p.160) at the Harvard Principals' Centre, 'It may be that sustained interpersonal contact is as central to learning and staff development as scope and sequence of content'. They continue:

> The logic is not complicated: if we can devise ways to help principals reflect thoughtfully and systematically upon the work they do, analyze that work, clarify their thinking through spoken and written articulation, and engage in conversations with others about that work, they will better understand their complex schools, the tasks confronting them, and their own styles as leaders. We are learning that understanding practice is the single most important precondition for improving practice. (Levine, Barth and Haskins, 1987, p.161)

In all, then, the role of the university in preparing school administrators for licensing is a central one. It is there that serious scholarly work can be done; and it is there that practising administrators can go to think, reflect, and learn together. But it has become obvious in the United States that granting the university a virtual stranglehold over access to preparation is not a positive factor for the trainees. While theory may be best propounded in a university, it is more easily taught to practitioners in a more familiar setting, in a network of people with whom they can identify and with whom they can consult. Already in the United States, school administrator preparation is taking place in principals' centres, 'academies', peer groups, which are affiliated with a university but which enjoy some autonomy. This shared training model, which we shall come back to in the next chapter, is an important concept to be tied into the licensing process. While the requirement that administrators be certified is important as a motivator to get candidates into preparation programmes, there is no good reason to allow university departments of education administration a hegemony over that training.

Neither should universities be left out. Turning over preliminary and on-going training of administrators to, say, the school districts, would be a grave mistake, even if licensure were stipulated, since 'trainers' in the districts cannot possibly have the background, resources, or ambiance that a university provides for real contemplation, research, development and training. Certainly the 'theory movement' in the study of education administration, which has flourished for over thirty years in the United States, would not occur amongst trainers scattered in school districts across the nation. Without the support system — the access to the disciplines of

psychology, sociology, political science, statistics, law, economics, philosophy, history, and so on, that university lecturers and professors of education administration can provide — it is very unlikely that good study and training would be possible.

The American model:
3. Access to training and administrative positions

The third issue that any licensing scheme will confront is determining who should be eligible for acceptance into the profession of school administration and, by direct implication, who should be trained and be permitted to apply for a licence, should one be created. Currently, the United States and Britain take very different tacks on this question. In the United States, the state licensing commission determines the necessary preconditions for certification, while in theory in Britain anyone might apply to be headteacher or chief education officer.

Thus, one of the effects of licensing is to cut off access to headships and directorships in schools to those who do not have the required experience and background. In the United States, the ladder to school leadership has several rungs; educators wishing to ascend must fulfil the stipulations on the level below before moving to a higher post. Figure 1 shows the steps and requirements for promotion into school management at various levels.

Anyone seeking entry into the education profession under the current system must go through the process of teacher training, including a bachelor's degree (or its equivalent), courses in teaching methods, a practicum as a 'student teacher', and licensing. After three to five years as a teacher, a candidate for an administrative position may then apply to a graduate programme in education administration, where they would receive the 30-credit (10 classes) programme, leading to *(1)* a master's degree in educational administration, *(2)* a practicum as an administrator — the internship, and *(3)* access to a state-awarded licence in school administration. Usually, a candidate for headship has spent three to five years as a member of senior staff, as a deputy head, head of grade, head of house, or chair of a department in a school.

Candidates for the central office job of superintendent of schools must have completed a set minimum number of years in a school as head, have some experience usually in the central office as deputy superintendent, supervisor, or chair of a school district department (curriculum, personnel, special education, etc.). In many states, more training, and an extension of the heads' licence to school district administrator are required, depending

on some additional graduate work. In all, then, the licensing process creates a career training ladder, which is spelled out in state statutes, and translated by universities into a course of study for prospective administrators.

Figure 1: Steps of the School Management Ladder and Requirements in the United States

4. Superintendency: (Chief Education Officer)
- State Superintendent Licence
- Master's and often Doctorate Degree in Educational Administration
- 5 Years' Experience as Head
- Expected central office experience as deputy.

3. Principalship: (Head)
- State Principal's Licence
- Master's Degree in Educational Administration
- 3 to 5 Years' Teaching Experience
- Often Experience as Assistant Principal

2. Assistant Principalship: (Deputy Head)
- State Principal's Licence
- Master's Degree in Educational Administration
- Active Teacher's Licence
- 3 to 5 Years Teaching Experience

1. Teacher:
- Bachelor's Degree or Equivalent
- Teacher Training Course
- Practice Teaching Experience
- Teacher's Licence

Advantages of a set licensing ladder

From the perspective of employers, districts and schools, the presence of a prescribed system of certification helps to standardize the preparation and to eliminate or at least reduce the incidence of outrageous abuse. Few will reach a headship or directorship without years of experience and training; the profession has perhaps as many as 20 years to look over a candidate as teacher, deputy head, head, deputy director, and director. Licensing gives some central body the authority to oversee the process, to keep records on possible offenders, and to provide some mark of approval from a state agency.

The lock-step quality of this system of licensing, as we shall discuss, does probably eliminate some of the most gifted of potential school leaders, who

may not wish to spend the years learning to teach, preparing for advanced training, and so on. But education is a conservative service, and where the safety of children is concerned, it tends to err on the side of caution. Licensing continues this policy.

The lock-step quality also ensures that candidates do not get promoted to headship without spending time at the chalkface, learning the problems of classroom management, of delivering a lesson, of handling children with a range of needs, of understanding the ethos of the effective classroom. As schools continue to stress instructional performance and quality, it becomes ever more important that heads, deputies and education officers understand the nature of good classroom performance — best learned (perhaps only learned) by practice as a teacher over a period of years.

A recent set of guidelines from the superintendents' group in the United States, the American Association of School Administrators (AASA), spells out the competencies and skills in instructional management that school leaders need:

> Planning and implementing an instructional management system which includes learning objectives, curriculum design, and instructional strategies and techniques that encourage high levels of achievement. This competency includes:
>
> a. Curriculum design and instructional delivery strategies [i.e., teaching];
> b. Instructional and motivational psychology;
> c. Alternative methods of monitoring and evaluating student achievement;
> d. Management of change to enhance the mastering of educational goals;
> e. Application of computer management to the instructional programme;
> f. Use of instructional time and resources;
> g. Cost-effectiveness and program budgeting. (AASA, n.d., p.9)

The management of these pedagogical techniques, which forms a major part of good school management today, probably requires that administrators spend some time in classrooms as teachers. Hence, the requirement of licensing agencies that some teaching experience is necessary for certification makes good sense.

In Britain, too, prior teaching is a requirement before assuming a headship, particularly in the absence of systems of formal administrator training and certification. Hiring agencies in both the United States and Britain expect to see a strong, if not outstanding, record of teaching before considering a person for a leadership role, though it does not always follow that good teachers make good administrators.

Disadvantage of lock-step entry

In the United States, the requirement that all candidates for administrative jobs must come up the same ladder is being questioned. Some suggestions are now being heard that lateral moves from industry, the armed services, and other fields into school administration may be useful in bringing talented people into education. And since the management of big school systems more and more resembles the running of other large institutions and businesses, it has become intriguing to consider appointing a corporate executive to run a large urban school district.

Some would argue, quite persuasively, that managing a system of a million students, 100,000 staff, 1,000 school buildings, has virtually nothing to do with classroom instruction; that large school systems can hire pedagogical experts, classroom supervisors, and subject specialists to work closely with teachers and heads; that the Chancellor of the New York City Public Schools, for example, needs to be a hard-hitting corporate strategist who can control a budget of nearly six billion dollars per year (larger than the national budgets of some smaller nations); that looking to labour relations with 100,000 employees from 26 different unions (teachers, transportation, engineers, electricians, plumbers, construction workers, food preparation staff, psychologists, supervisors, architects, etc.) requires the same background as the head of a major industry; and that relating to the constituencies in the city, state, and national governments requires a legal and political skill that hardly resembles good 'teaching' at all.

Thus, there is some need, now, to break the lock-step and to allow leaders of national stature to try their hand at school management at the highest levels. Certainly, this is more likely in Britain, where the formal preparation is less of a requirement. But even in the United States, a number of states have experimented with bringing in laterally some leaders from other fields to give a helping hand to schools. The first glimmer of this came in the areas of labour relations in the 1960s. As teacher militancy increased, school management, or boards of education, could not find skilled labour negotiators amongst the ranks of current administrators, most of whom had been promoted out of the teachers' associations prior to collective negotiations in education. Thus, it was not uncommon in many districts to hire a director of personnel from industry, to be given a quick course in educational management, an 'emergency' certificate, and a job dealing with union demands, collective bargaining, contract interpretation, walkouts, grievances, and so on.

Similar promotions are seen for school attorneys, computer experts, and even in specialized fields where a head needs a background in a trade or

skill. The advantages of some open access, some leaping up the stairsteps to leadership, are the bringing in of specially qualified people from the legal, business and commercial communities who could contribute a great deal to school management, but who may not have taught in school first.

Britain, if it embarks on a certification process, should leave open avenues for leadership with some safeguards to prevent the appointment of the unsuitable. A course of study, with clearly delineated prior experience and with internships should combine to improve quality. Certification is the trigger for making the whole system work.

Summary

Britain has a great opportunity to improve school management through the use of a newly-created certification procedure. In this chapter, we have reviewed the strengths and pitfalls of such a system, drawing heavily upon the experience of years of certification of administrators in the United States.

A standard programme of training clearly has some advantages and, in our view, should be tried in Britain. Through it educators would have a clear career path, from teacher to headteacher to senior LEA management. A course of study, located mainly — but not exclusively — at the university could be generalized: such programmes already exist in many places. Certification would give regularity to a system, which is now haphazard, and often inadequate. Certification would bring the universities into partnership with schools, LEAs, administrators-in-training, government, business, and the whole community of 'management studies' throughout the world.

Britain, then, should require certification for all new administrators, drawing on the positive features of existing models elsewhere. With the criticisms of a standard training and certification programme in mind, it should be possible to design a training approach which captures the best elements of standardization, regularity, and past history, while moving ahead in creative new ways. In the next chapter, we shall draw upon the qualities of training which we have discussed in this chapter in suggesting a certification process for Great Britain. We shall treat the issues of certification as an urgent need now in Great Britain, discussing how to get started, the policy and the process of certification, and the contents of academic programmes.

Chapter Three

Certification

The Time is Right in Britain

> It is difficult not to be disturbed by the low level of training to which the majority of those in managerial positions had been exposed — in terms of both quality and quantity. The extent to which the education service relies on chance in developing management skills in its members must be a matter of concern. If there were any underlying strategies for accomplishing this development, or sets of guidelines, they were nowhere apparent. (Everard, 1987, p.69)

* * *

> There should no longer be any need to argue the case for formal training for those in, or aspiring to, leadership positions in education. Much that should underpin the educational leaders's work cannot be adequately or effectively taught on the job, and the amount of relevant material is constantly increasing. (Glatter, 1972, p.70)

The need for adequate preparation for new school leaders, and continued professional and technical development of those hardly working in the education service, should already need further argument at this point. However, the certification of administrators is a more controversial matter, though numerous examples of countries requiring it have been reported (Van der Pere and Vandenbergh, 1987). In this chapter, we shall take the plunge and support the contention that Britain should now move towards mandatory certification for head teachers and other senior staff by the creation of an independent Society of School Administrators (SSA) to promote quality in the field and to oversee preparation and certification. The introduction of certification is essential, in our view, to ensure that this much-needed training is provided and accepted; to promote a national strategy for such formal preparation; and to bring order and focus to these efforts.

1. Certification: why now?

The time is right. Changing conditions in the education service make it both timely and appropriate to pursue an active effort to train and license school headteachers and their senior staff. Schools are special institutions linked directly to national productivity, literacy, and full participation of students in civic life. Knowing that headteachers and their management teams are well trained in the latest management and financial techniques should add to the community's confidence and should benefit teachers and pupils in a direct way.

Further, as the Thatcher Government increases opportunities for the autonomy of local schools, through such programmes as 'opting out', the creation of city technology colleges (CTCs), and mandatory 'devolution to the school site', the need to support the school senior staff becomes all the greater. Schools cannot be pressured to improve and then be cast adrift, independent from the management functions of local authorities without instruction in good, local school-level, management techniques. Reform of structure demands reform of training.

That is not to say that *some* heads in Britain are failing to receive adequate training now; many have participated in a range of short and long courses in school management run by universities, polytechnics, and local authorities. A number have also managed their schools with strong, visionary leadership without very much training (Sayer, 1985, pp.150-152). Learning by doing, on the job, is still a very effective way to polish skills in budgeting, staffing, planning, decision-making, supervision, staff development, public relations and fund raising (and the list goes on).

As Henley explains, local financial management (one key element of local school management) has been introduced in many places, usually by permitting heads and their staff to switch funds around between budget categories, the practice of 'virement' which 'effectively gives heads and their staff control over the budgets in the simplest possible way' (Henley, 1987, p.267). Staff involvement in these decentralized decisions appears as a critical part of localized management, Henley concludes:

> Schools should be able to exercise virement between resources which were already allocated on a clearly understood basis. In the first instance during a relaxed learning period, proposals would be examined to ensure that full consultation had taken place and that all implications were clearly understood. On this basis, school would immediately have discretion over the lion's share of their resources-teachers, ancillary staff and current capitation votes, and it would be after all entirely voluntary! (ibid.)

But a swelling consensus is emerging that the learning time could be dramatically cut and techniques improved by some prior preparation — the learning of guiding skills and principles, the building of effective collegial networks (other heads to call in emergencies), and chances to practise skills through job internships before having to employ them. And for all those heads, deputies, and department chairs who are natural, intuitive administrators, who need little formal training, there are many more who could benefit (and absolutely need help) in preparing to manage better their schools' funds and programmes. Also, good management of schools goes further than shifting funds amongst budget categories. It also involves concern for improved staffing, programmes, achievement, better instructional leadership, skills which may not easily be acquired on the job.

Thus, certification may be the only way to guarantee that all senior school staff are prepared for their jobs. After all, virtually all other professions require training and have licensing boards, maintained by various professional societies, to see that this preparation is done: the General Medical Council, the Law Society, the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy, and so on. Why should Britain not have a Society of School Administrators to set standards for the profession, to oversee the training, to establish criteria for service, raise quality, advocate improved resources and training, supervise the service and see that their members perform at the highest level? The model is in place in other fields, and the time is right to consider this move to certification of school leadership.

The United States has not used a model of autonomous societies controlling access to the profession. Instead, each of the 50 state governments has its own certification requirements, sets standards, and provides licensure, much as the Department of Education and Science controls teacher certification in Britain now. (Meanwhile, many teachers' and headteachers' organizations in Britain and the United States have become trade unions, not professional societies, and have largely relinquished control over entry and quality within the education service to government.)

We believe that to set up a Society of School Administrators would be consonant with Britain's long tradition of professional societies, guilds and associations. The concept is so well established in Britain that organizations can be private, and, with the agreement of government, take on key 'public' functions. After all, if the nation trusts the doctors, lawyers, engineers, veterinarians, accountants and many others to oversee their own work, preparation and practice, under the watchful eye of government, why should school heads and other senior staff be any different? Elevating the profession, letting it control its own destiny, in co-operation with government, is a

workable model for licensing senior staff (and teachers, too, for that matter).

It would be difficult now to argue against training for school administrators in Britain. It is more radical to seek a means of licensing these efforts. But unless some means for organizing and extending this training is created, the chances of universal formal preparation will remain something which almost everyone favours but few can provide. Thus, the requirement to license, through a national society, rests on these points:

New national priorities

A national certification requirement would mean that educators, government, professional associations, universities, and businesses would have to face up to the issue. A deadline, say, of 1993 could be set, after which time any candidate for a school management job would be expected to have a licence issued by the Society of School Administrators. Veteran administrators could perhaps be given more time; and though they would not lose their present jobs if they failed to earn a certificate, they could not expect to be promoted, or to change jobs, without eventual SSA certification.

Certification, then, would make the training of administrators a national priority and would bring resources to bear. Industry might finance some trainees and Government, LEAs and other sources might put up some additional money. Individuals might also be willing to pay for their own preparation for certification. With the goal of certification clearly in sight, paths to it would be quickly beaten; the requirement would energize the process.

A national strategy

Currently, there is no strategy in Britain for preparing administrators for schools. While most agree that it is a good idea, to date no one has put forward a way of achieving it. Hence, many headteachers receive virtually no preparation. Others receive a whole range of training options, including day workshops, short sessions, one week courses, 20 to 40 day courses, one-term programmes, master's and even doctoral degree courses. Yet, for all this variety, no body has given shape to these efforts, to see that they amount to adequate training. And many school senior staff receive no preparation at all.

It could be the role of the Society of School Administrators, working with LEAs, universities and management consultants from business, to determine some kind of 'credit system', whereby candidates could receive, say, one credit for a 20-day short course, a half credit for a weekend training retreat, two credits for a one-term course, (similar to the One-Term Training

Opportunity which has been used for some two years). Perhaps an administrative 'internship' could be established, for another credit or two, which would allow trainees to amass, say, eight credits, enough work to gain a certificate, and even a master's degree, at the end.

While this patched-together system is not ideal, and a year-long master's certification course done full-time is preferable, it would allow practising educators to continue in their regular jobs and pursue their certificate training in the evenings, summers, weekends, in a variety of classroom, field, and home-study experiences. Since government cannot afford to train the nearly 150,000 administrative personnel in primary, secondary, and further education immediately (see Squire, 1987, Appendix J, for a breakdown of managers in education), some private and personal initiatives (already seen in many university courses where students pay their own tuition) are likely, necessitating that trainees keep their jobs while they are studying.

Without a national strategy for training, culminating in some kind of certification, there is little hope of extending the benefits of formal preparation to all those who run Britain's schools (Hughes et al., 1981). At present, no one is putting the pieces together, setting the parameters, and letting administrators-in-training know what is expected.

National standards

Another result of certification for school senior staff will be a move towards national standards on many levels. First, the certification agency, the Society of School Administrators (SSA) would set the standard for those seeking a licence. It could establish a School Administrator Accreditation Board to review a candidate's training, internship, competencies, performance, and even the results of a certification examination, if and when one is designed, to see that new senior staff were qualified. Secondly, the SSA could give guidance and set standards for the various training programmes, much as the General Medical Council oversees medical school curricula and teaching. Third, the SSA might set standards of conduct and practice for school administrators, and ensure that ethical and professional standards were upheld. So, the results of certification might be an improvement in admissions, training, performance, *and* conduct for professionals in school leadership positions.

Now is the time to consider certification of school senior staff in Britain. The need for training is obvious. Without a licensing requirement, there may be no practical way to get things moving; to stimulate candidates to seek training and instutitions and agencies to provide it. Key to the process is some central agency to start the process, focus the energy, and set the

standards and the national strategy.

2. Certification: how to get started

The most difficult steps on the road to certification are the first few, that is, how to sell the concept and get people working on it. The school heads' associations, and the Society of Education Officers, might agree that they want to license their members, control access to the profession, help universities design the courses of study, work with government to enforce these processes, set and maintain professional standards — all the things that other professional societies in law, medicine, architecture, engineering, property, insurance, accountancy, even armed services, already do. This approach would be ideal, though given the current feelings amongst many educators *as employees*, most school administrators' associations are unlikely to impose certification requirements upon themselves.

Instead, we would suggest that the Government, as part of its reform effort, might have to impose the certification requirement, much as it did for teachers, and then help to establish a national society for the provision of training and certification. Quangos, voluntary societies, guilds, are common. The process might begin with a Department of Education and Science inquiry into preparation and certification.

Whatever the avenue, it is desirable that some agency or group act. In the United States, an interesting parallel has occurred. At present, there is no *national* certification for teachers, only state-by-state licensing. At the suggestion of Myron Lieberman (1985), a group of teachers' unions, government agencies, university staff and foundations, have banded together to create voluntary educational specialty boards, again using the medical training model. Any teacher in the United States (and there are nearly four million of them) may apply to become nationally 'board certified' as a master teacher. Upon request, a team is dispatched to interview the teacher, observe his or her teaching performance, and inspect students' work. If his or her performance is outstanding, a teacher is issued a national board licence — which gives national recognition, testimony to quality, and, it is hoped, greater pay from local school systems.

This development was initiated by a scholar, taken up by teachers' associations and unions (the American Federation of Teachers and National Education Association), and funded by a generous grant from the Carnegie Foundation. At some point, state governments will have to agree to recognize the new credentials and reward teachers with extra pay and responsibility. It seems that, local school authorities in the United States are so pleased

to have some of these nationally-accredited teachers on their staff that they give them more responsibility (say, helping in local staff development), and pay them more, if for no other reason than the public relations value of having these national 'celebrities' on their staff.

Britain, if it is to move towards training and certification for its headteachers, might approach it from several directions.

Parliament and the Secretary of State take action

One means would be for Parliament to enact, or the Secretary of State for Education to mandate, that all heads and senior staff be trained and certified by a certain time. Then, it would be up to the Department of Education and Science, LEAs, universities, heads' associations, and others to work out the details of how to get school senior staff trained. The new law (or executive circular) could create a Society of School Administrators (SSA) with a School Administrator Accreditation Board (SAAB) under the auspices of the DES, or with limited independence, which could set the standards, prescribe the means for accruing credits, perhaps design a test for heads to take, and review the applications, all leading to the issuing of a licence much like that teachers now receive.

Having Parliament take action has several advantages. First, it would throw the full weight of statute behind the requirement, and makes it clear what must be done to be licensed. Secondly, it would overcome some of the inaction and in-fighting that might occur if such steps were taken privately by school administrators themselves. Thirdly, it would be consistent with certification of other educators, and could build upon that experience.

The disadvantages are also obvious. Having the Government take control over licensing would undercut the much-needed professionalism of school heads, leading to many of the problems seen in the United States (see the examples described in Chapter Two above). Government regulations tend to become bureaucratized — with the amassing of credits, taken anywhere, for any reason, displacing more important professional interests in getting a certificate. The psychological efforts of losing control over their own 'profession' might reverse some of the progress that headteachers acting for themselves might make towards autonomy, control, and higher standards.

The system of accredition might, like the American system, become credit-driven, lock-step, university-based, and incoherent. It would let the senior staff off the hook, turning their responsibilities over to the state. Similarly, some might ask, 'If the government requires and controls the process, why does not the government also pay for all the training?' Once all training is to be a state-imposed, government-sponsored effort, then the chance of

getting the 150,000 or so administrators in education (Squire, 1987) licensed virtually disappears. Instead, prospective school heads, deputy heads, inspectors, co-ordinators, officers, should see the personal, professional benefit of training and pay for much of it themselves. LEAs, government, and other public agencies might support some of the efforts — say, a tuition-free, two-credit, internship for each trainee after so many university and in-service credits — but most of the preparation should be seen as a personal investment in the future of these professionals and be financed by them.

Thus, if Parliament legislates for certification, or the Secretary of State for Education simply mandates it, then the Government should be sure to involve the educators-in-training and their associations and groups, together with the universities and the business management sector, to see that the preparation is professional and involvement is personal — not another government mandate paid for by grants. While it may be appropriate and even essential for the Government to take the first steps towards certification, the next should be in a spirit of devolution which allows the profession itself ultimately to assume the major responsibility.

A private initiative

A much preferred approach, though one that is more difficult to initiate, is to enable educationalists, working with government, business, parents, school governors and universities, to start their own professional licensing process. A group of interested parties could be identified, meetings held, programmes spelled out, a 'seed' grant sought, much like the Carnegie grant started the national teacher speciality boards in the United States. In this way a new professional society would be born.

School administrators in Britain would be in charge of their own professional development, standards, and improvement. This would answer Nunnery's (1982) complaint about American certification, that administrators in the United States have forfeited control over their own affairs. The model of the other professions — medicine, law, accountancy, engineering, architecture — is a powerful one, and deserves closer scrutiny by those designing training schemes for school leaders. Certainly if school managers are looking to business administration for guidance, then taking control over their own fate is a first major step.

The problems with expecting a group which is now so painfully divided concerning its common interests to support certification are obvious (another government plot to weaken the teaching profession, they might say). Headteachers, for example, have found themselves caught in the middle during 'strike actions' by teachers' unions in Britain over the last few years.

While headteachers function as 'management', many also identify with the needs of their staff and sympathize with their efforts to hold on to bargaining rights. For historical reasons, too, headteachers find their associations actively participating in the collective bargaining efforts (before teacher contract negotiations, unresolved for nearly two years, were suspended by the Secretary of State), as representatives of the interests of headteachers and other senior staff. Thus, recent developments in labour relations in Britain have cast the heads' associations as 'unions', making it difficult for them also to champion compulsory certification, particularly when the system of training is in such a confusing state.

Perhaps if the Government would provide the push, the heads' associations would take the initiative and move towards controlling their own certification once they realized that licensing was inevitable. One does not know. But getting started soon is important if the leadership in Britain's schools is to put its training on a proper footing, and if the nation is to ensure that those who run the schools are qualified, prepared, and supported. Action by government, followed by direct involvement of school senior staff themselves, is perhaps the most problematic step in the certification process.

3. Certification: the policy and the process

Certification policies in Britain should take full and creative advantage of current training capabilities and experiences. It would be unwise to discount the existing training programmes, the diplomas, degrees and certificates in educational administration that many senior school staff have already achieved at universities and polytechnics, within their LEAs and schools, and from outside agencies such as management consulting firms and government. We suggest that once a certification policy is established, a highly flexible strategy be developed to build upon existing training capacity and experiences, while both expanding them and giving them new shape and direction. Perhaps, too, once established, certification would lead to some new, innovative approaches such as the 'staff college' concept (Albright, 1986), the Harvard Principals' Center, or the Australian 'administrative training institute', a two-month residential programme used in the state of Victoria (Moyle et al., 1987).

It is useful, then, to examine resources that already exist for training — and see how they might be deployed, expanded, and systematized to create a certification process in Britain. While the United States has relied too heavily on the 'one best model', in which virtually all training is the prerogative of the university, we hope that Britain will take a more flexible,

inclusive rather than exclusive, approach, involving a range of institutions and experiences. The metaphor should be of a net thrown over a variety of useful learning experiences, rather than of a narrow tunnel through which all must pass in order to obtain certification.

We shall discuss the policy and the process, from making it mandatory that all senior staff in education receive training and certification, through to the creation of a modular credit system to take account of various training programmes, on-the-job internships and other practical experiences. The policy should build on current practices where possible.

Licensing requirements and a possible timetable

The first policy step would be to require headteachers, deputy heads, heads of department, and other senior school staff to receive certification appropriate for their career development. As discussed above, this stipulation might be made (1) by Parliament, as part of its school reforms, (2) by the Secretary of State for Education in a training circular, and/or (3) by voluntarily requirements laid down by school heads and officials themselves in co-operation with the Department of Education and Science.

In the United States, the regulations for licensing of school administrators are explicit and well developed. We have reviewed the regulations of a number of states such as California, Nebraska, New York, Texas and Utah and find that they are similar in most respects. In New York State, for example, the State Education Department requires the following:

> 1. *Preparation:* The candidate shall hold a baccalaureate degree . . . and shall have completed 30 semester hours of graduate study and an approved administrative-supervisory internship under the supervision of a practising school administrator and of a representative of the sponsoring institution of higher education. Within the total programme of preparation, the candidate shall have been awarded a master's degree. These 30 semester hours shall include twenty-four hours of graduate study in the field of school administration and supervision. An internship experience carrying graduate credit may be included within the 30 hour programme. One year of satisfactory full-time experience in a school administrative or supervisory position may be substituted for the internship.
> 2. *Experience:* Three years of teaching and/or administrative and/or supervisory and/or public personnel service experience in the public schools (Nursery level through 12th grade [upper 6th form]). Section 207 of Education Law, N.Y. State, 1987

In contrast to this state-imposed approach, the exact details of certification in Britain should be worked out in a representative committee, including

those needing the training, employers, government, and the training community (universities, polytechnics, management trainers). We have some suggestions in Table 4 for a timetable.

These steps give some idea of the process leading to full certification of school senior staff and the policies required. While obviously they are just suggestions, they illustrate the need for leadership from government and the educational community and for co-operation amongst the various agencies.

Table 4: Timetable for establishing certification requirements

1. Early 1989: Government announces intention to require training and certification for senior school staff.

2. Mid 1989: Government establishes a Commission made up of all relevant groups to lay groundwork for standard training and certification of school administrators.

3. Late 1989: Commission works with school senior staff to establish a Society of School Administrators, and within the Society a School Administrator Accreditation Board to set requirements and training options.

4. Early 1993: All new heads, deputies, chairs, heads of department appointed after this date must show evidence of training and certification.

5. Early 1993: All senior school staff must show evidence of training activities and have a 'plan' for receiving a certificate before being appointed to new positions or promotions.

6. Early 1996: All senior staff have received training and are ready to apply for certification from the Society through the School Administrator Accreditation Board.

A credit system

Whatever the outcome of this process, it will be essential to find a means of giving credit for training experience received at universities, colleges of higher education, polytechnics, and within LEAs. Such a credit system has already been discussed by the training community. For example, in a recent Newsletter of the National Development Centre for School Management Training at the University of Bristol (Spring 1987), Newby proposes that (1) courses be modularized, broken into workable sub-parts, to allow administrators-in-training to take pieces of the programme over a period of time and (2) credits be organized so that candidates can accumulate the necessary graduate work at various institutions, for various activities

to gain a degree (and likewise a certificate). He continues:

> . . . and most significantly, [the new funding arrangement] is causing Higher Education providers to modularize. For example, the master's degree, which formerly was a long course, part-time or full-time, will now become a course made up of a set of discrete modules. Teachers may still take the complete set in one go — if they can obtain the funding. Alternatively, they may take them one at a time, building up *credits* until they have accumulated sufficient for the award of the degree. The CAT scheme (Credit Accumulation and Transfer) now being developed takes this important innovation further: *if a national currency of course hours can be agreed*, it will become possible for a teacher to build up credits for each module in different locations. If all higher education institutions were to agree, we could have a national system operational, mobile across space as well as time. (Newby, 1987, p.2, our italic)

Thus, for students of educational administration, the credit unit could become the currency of exchange, with the accumulation of credits leading to certification. The establishment of certification requires an educational summit at which universities, all schools of higher education, LEAs, government, and school administrators themselves would decide upon *credit equivalencies* to be accumulated and 'cashed in' with the accreditation board (SAAB) for a certificate.

This call for a system of credits has come at a time when course providers are competing with one another under the Government's new Grant-Related In-Service Training (GRIST) plan (Bolam, 1986). The introduction of the 'market economy' (National Development Centre, Spring 1987) into higher education training has the potential either to force providers to work closely with administrators and employers or to destroy training altogether in Britain. For as Newby explains,

> Institutions of higher education are having to rethink their overall strategies. Some have decided to offer their award-bearing courses in the afternoon and evenings or out of school time entirely, and those that are retaining their day-release courses are wondering whether they will continue to recruit students . . . One paradox is that providers are now placed in direct competition with one another but, simultaneously, they also have to work co-operatively and collaboratively if they are to make best use of their collective resources. (Newby, 1987, p.1)

More likely, the introduction of a credit system, on top of the panoply of available, and competing, offerings from universities, polytechnics, LEAs and other institutions, will provide a rich set of opportunities to potential

trainees. This open market approach is quite different to that in the United States, where the universities alone have appropriated the training process by being the only recognized institutions to offer official credits toward the licence. Attempts by 'out of state' groups, such as the NOVA University in Florida, to invade the domain of the state universities with 'extension programmes' have been resisted fiercely, as university graduate schools of education have fought to protect their monopoly.

The exact nature of the credit system cannot be spelled out here. We can make some suggestions, however, based on current practices in Britain, particularly in the master's programmes in school administration which can provide criteria for issuing credits toward a school senior staff certificate. Currently, a master's programme in educational administration such as the one at the Institute of Education, University of London, requires six terms of work part-time, with two modules per term, for a total of 12 modules of graduate work (full-time, it requires four modules per term for one year). Since each module carries a half-credit, a student receives the MA in Educational Administration after completing six credits, or 12 half-credit modules. If a student then added *two more* credits for an administrative internship, the basic format of a certification scheme emerges. Table 5 shows the breakdown of modules, time periods, classes, and credits which might be a framework for a full-time master's and certification process.

This course of study is often done in two years, with two modules per term for six (instead of 12 per year), taking 30 hours of in-class work per term, for 3.0 credits a year. Using this same format, one could conceive of the Society of School Administrators (SSA), the DES, and LEAs agreeing to co-operate in a CAT (credit accumulation and transfer) approach with workshops, one-day, two-day, short courses, one-term training options, etc., being developed to create a certification package for administrators.

As shown in Table 6, the credit system might offer trainees a course of study with a mix of longer and shorter concentrations of preparation over, say, a three-year time period, allowing administrators-in-training to gain their certificate (plus a master's degree or diploma).

Using these credit-equivalencies, as established by a national panel, or by SSA, working with universities, LEAs, and business management, administrators trainees could put together a sequence of experiences to gain a certificate. That is, candidates might do a *short-course* at a university for 60 hours, or two credits; a series of *workshops* sponsored by their LEAs alone and by a joint effort of their LEAs and a management consulting firm, a university department of educational administration, or other groups for, say, two weekends each, for 22.5 hours each, for twice .75 credits. Then,

working in their school authority, they could complete *a peer supervision* experience, where they shadow an administrator, work on a budgeting *task force*, assist in a staff deployment and development scheme, and spend a week during holiday learning in practical management in a local business or commercial firm as *visiting administrator*. Once an *administrative internship* is formally completed for 60 hours, or two credits, after a year of actual management responsibility in a school, supervised by both a university lecturer and an LEA administrator, candidates should have amassed the necessary credits and hours to apply for a certificate.

Table 5: Full-Time Master's Course in Education Administration

Terms	*Modules*	*Hours*	*Credits*	*Topics (e.g.)*
Term 1:	1	15	.5	Intro. to School Admin.
	2	15	.5	Admin. and Organizations
	3	15	.5	Public Policy and Schools
	4	15	.5	Change Processes
Total:	4	60	2.0	
Term 2:	5	15	.5	Admin. Processes
	6	15	.5	Team Building
	7	15	.5	Planning
	8	15	.5	Leadership in Schools
Total:	4	60	2.0	
Term 3:	9	15	.5	Economics of Educn.
	10	15	.5	Evaluation of Staff
	11	15	.5	Dissertation Work and
	12	15	.5	Research Methods
Total:	4	60	2.0	
GRAND TOTAL: 12 MODULES = 180 HOURS = 6.0 CREDITS				
ADD: 2 Credits for 1-Year Internship: Certificate = 8.0 Credits				

Using old and new funding resources

While the above mixed modular approach is necessarily a rather crude portrayal of the system, it does give some sense of the use of existing training resources, rationalized by a credit accumulation and transfer process extended to include preparation programmes in universities, LEAs, independent training agencies, and schools, jointly or separately done. Once a series of such programmes is established and given the go-ahead by the

accrediting agency (School Administrator Accreditation Board), then a framework is established for creating new programmes for preparing and licensing school senior staff.

The advantages of this mixed-modular approach include its practicality, flexibility, and openness. Without using these existing opportunities for training, there is little hope of getting Britains' 150,000 school administrators formally trained. True, if the government were willing simply to require certification and let the administrators pay for it themselves the best way they could, then the American approach of requiring university degree programmes for certification might work. It would necessitate that all senior staff in British schools enrol in a graduate programme in educational administration, and the Government would pay for only a small part of the costs.

Table 6: Licensing Process Using a Mixed-Modular Approach

	Credits	*Hours*	
	Conditions		
1. University-Based Programmes:			
Master's/Diploma	6.0 *	180	Part/Full-time
a. Short Courses:	2.0	60	Full-time
b. One-Term Option:	1.0	30	Full-time
2. Co-operative Programmes:			
a. Internships:	2.0 **	60	1-Year Required
b. Task Groups:	.25	7.5	Part-time
c. Workshops:	.75	22.5	Part-time
3. LEA/School-Based Programmes:			
a. Workshops:	.75	22.5	Part-time
b. Demonstration Projects:	.5	15	Part-time
c. Peer Supervision:	.25	7.5	Part-time
d. Other activities:	.5	15	
TOTAL: Credits:8		Hours: 240	

A University *Master's course of six credits and 180 modularized hours, plus a two-Credit **Internship, would equal a licensing programme of eight Credits.

Future research should include some precise tabulation of the expenses involved in such training, using a diverse group of providers and public and private funding. In the United States, the cost of training tuition for the licence runs to about $4,000 per trainee, on average, incurred when registering at a university for the ten courses at about $400 per course (per module in the British context). In addition, school districts in the United States have a staff development budget which spends, say, $200 per administrator per year on management re-training. Finally, administrators are expected to renew the licenses with additional courses (in New York, for example, the 'management of special education' was added to the requirements when in the 1970s it became obvious that headteachers needed to learn something about operating mainstream and special education programmes in their schools). Since there are about 400,000 administrators in the United States, the total national cost of training over a career amounts to $200 million, most of which is absorbed by the administrators themselves. If divided by the number of pupils in American schools, some 40 million, the scale of costs for training is about $50 per student over the lifetime of the senior staff member. Similar data are not yet available in Britain.

Under the old funding schemes in Britain, it was almost impossible to work out what a training option actually cost the Government, since money very rarely changed hands and local authorities received their funding in terms of credits to university providers. Cooper explains the problem as follows:

> Until now, tutors in departments of higher education institutions . . . have not been directly concerned with financial matters. They have known vaguely about the 'pool', which was some mythical and mysterious natatorium into which the local authorities dipped in order to pay for the various in-service activities of their teachers. Both the long award-bearing courses and many of the shorter non-award-bearing courses were paid for in this way . . . Fees were charged, it is true, but it was often a gentlemanly system of credit and chalking up on the slate . . . The accounting system was so convoluted and obscure and the money so much bound up with other kinds of local expenditures that . . . nobody could provide them with anything more accurate than estimates. (Newby, 1987, p.3)

But currently, funding policies require that someone actually accounts for the real costs of preparing administrators. With present changes, furthermore, fewer and fewer administrators-in-training in Britain are going to universities for preparation. Newby (1987) writes that 'the long course is likely to disappear as a form of INSET (In-Service Education for Teachers). "Courses" in the future are likely to be less than 20 days *in total*,

will move into a part-time mode, and will often require teachers to give up their own time to attend them' (p.2), and perhaps, too, their own money. And LEAs must now ask for a grant from Government for training, and hope that part of it is forthcoming: Cooper writes:

> The local authorities are the hub around which the system revolves. They have to write out their shopping lists annually and present them to the controller of the purse-strings — the DES — to get their spending money. If the list is approved, they will be given 50 per cent of what they asked for or 70 per cent, if it is something which is flavour of the month. They are then free to spend it in the market place at any market stall they choose. It does not have to be the Higher Education Shop where they have always shopped before. They can go to the Private Consultants Supermarket down the road it they so wish. (Newby, 1987, p.3)

Thus, LEAs are now setting up their own co-ordinating committees, and programmes. In part, this move away from the university is due to a change in funding policy. In the past, the Government via the LEAs remitted costs to the universities, polytechnics and colleges for training out of a national fund, the so-called 'pool'; now the DES is giving those funds for Grant Related In-Service Training (GRIST) to the LEAs, which in turn are delivering them to schools. Universities, and other training institutions, are having to compete to meet school training needs with other providers, and offer a variety of provisions, not just long courses.

Furthermore, the Government policy leading to devolution of finance to schools could well intensify the trend away from using long-courses and degree programmes, because each school will receive a rather small, per-capita grant for staff development. It would be highly unlikely that head teachers could spend the entire staff development grant on their own degree (certification) programmes when other staff members in the school need professional development also.

LEAs and schools have no coherent training strategy to meet this change in funding. In a survey of the 104 LEAs, the National Development Centre found that not a single LEA had a local training plan that would match up to the following model provided by the Centre:

> The LEA has a coherent and explicit policy for management development aimed at school improvement. Procedures and staff exist for implementing the policy in the form of a regular programme. The programme includes the use of job descriptions, development interviews and other methods of diagnosing the needs at individual, school, and LEA levels, and a varied range of on-the-job, close-to-the-job and off-the-job activities. Off-the-job courses, including specific grant

provisions, are one component of the programme and the LEA has an infrastructure and personnel capable of supporting course participants during the preparatory and following stages, and of relating such courses to the identified needs of the LEA and its schools. Heads, senior staff, advisers, and officers regularly engage in the programme which is systematically monitored and evaluated in terms of school improvement. (National Development Centre, 1987, p.5)

One of the advantages of certification would be truer cost estimates of training expenses and the possibility of shifting the onus of responsibility for training to individual administrators, since it is their careers which will benefit. Once a credit system were established, and real costs estimated, a clear structure would be in place for individual heads, advisers, inspectors, and officers to pursue certification, instead of the rather confusing system (or non-system) of programmes now available. Decentralization, it seems to us, is crucial, if administrators are to take control of their own professional lives. As it stands now, separate school managers are in a sense trapped by idiosyncracies of local training programmes, the whims and mysteries of DES funding, and the non-existence of the kind of strategy described by the National Development Centre.

University providers could benefit financially, as they have in the United States, by training which is seen as a *personal-professional development activity*, not as the primary responsibility of government, LEAs, and schools. As it stands now in Britain, the public pays (1) for the costs of training, either directly by paying for university courses or for outside consultants to the LEA, and (2) the indirect costs of replacing administrators-in-training (usually teachers) while they are away from their regular jobs. Little private funding is involved, a carry-over from the notion that training for promotion is the school's, and thus the state's, responsibility, not that of the candidate. Once certification became established, we could expect to see a great increase in private contributions from trainees as a form of investment in their own career advancement. This infusion of money would mean that many more managers could get training and many more providers (universities, polytechnics, management consulting groups) could be paid to help with preparation for certification.

We think, then, that a number of policies need to be developed or changed if certification is to become a reality. First, some group has to make certification of administrators a requirement, as we have described above. Secondly, policies must be constructed which will allow administrators to get the certificate, building on the existing training capacity. A credit system would be a necessary next step, with trainees able to pick up credits for

various experiences in universities, LEAs, schools, and even in business and industry.

An internship also seems to be a good idea, to see if in fact a neophyte can do administrative work and provide leadership in schools. Perhaps a newly trained administrator might first be given a probationary certificate — much as teachers are now — after completing the eight credits of training, and be fully certificated only after successfully completing a full year or two in a leadership post. This probationary period was advocated by the Department of Education and Science in 1984, but was dropped. Probation, as a key part of the licensing process, makes good sense, since it would overcome the problem of certifying someone as a headteacher, say, without actually seeing his or her ability to do the job. This step would also be a useful check on the quality of training, since new administrators could report on the relevance of the training experiences in their first year's work.

Thirdly, additional resources should be available, and not all (or even most) of them from government. Why not let professionals invest in their own future, increasing the level of funding beyond what the public can afford?

The modular, credit accumulation and transfer approach seems to overcome many of the shortcomings of the American 'one best model'. It allows a better mix of field-based, in-school methods to emerge; it means that no single agency gains hegemony over training, as in the United States, for the universities would share the training function with other agencies in Britain, in a mixed environment. This breaks the straitjacket of academic, overly-theoretical, approaches, something we shall discuss in a later section.

However, the disadvantages are very much with us as well. A mixed approach can easily become unstable and chaotic, as we see in training in Britain now. Who is to see that LEA workshops are intellectually respectable, useful, and coherent? Would not a series of six or eight modules, as described in Table 5 above, become so disorganized and incoherent that trainees might fail to grasp an overall philosophy, purpose, and set of practices from their training? Disjointed, separated, and intermittent programmes may be more confusing than useful, whereas at least with a course of study in a university, students have some chance of building on theory and practice in the field. Would one want doctors to learn medicine in small, widely differing and disconnected segments in various locations, over two or three years, without adequate provision for scope and sequence of curriculum and evaluation of outcomes?

It would be the role of the Society of School Administrators, working with universities, LEAs, DES, and others to see that some common themes, techniques, and practices are established and perhaps tested in a certification

examination at the end. But until certification is required, this kind of coherence and energy is unlikely to be generated, bringing us back to those involved in certification.

By now, it should be obvious who should be involved in certification, or at least who should be consulted. In the initial stages, the government must play a key role in establishing the certification requirement by establishing the principle and the time-frame for carrying out the policies. This initiative would bring the parties to the table, as each group came to realize its interest in training and setting the conditions of certification. The participation of headteachers, other school staff, school inspectors and education officers is crucial, as is the participation of business and industry, universities, and other training institutions. Each group has a unique role to play in the process and it is crucial to bring them together.

In summary, then, to accomplish licensing, a number of policy decisions and steps will have to be taken:

Mandate training and certification

Britain could follow the American model, requiring all senior staff to have a licence and then set up the apparatus for carrying out this mandate: lists of requirements, institutions to provide the training (universities), procedures for application, etc. This would lead, as in the United States, to a one-standard programme mentality, with an orthodoxy, a lock-step process, and university control. This approach would be direct, simple and top-down in control.

We have indicated in Chapter Two the disadvantages of the American model. The 'one best model' would quickly displace a more varied, local, and interesting method, as a bureaucratic process takes over. The impact on the school management profession would be immediate, as senior staff came under full state regulation. We prefer a more integrated approach, one in which a variety of training options are available, varying training techniques are used, and a mix of training institutions, sites, and experiences are attempted.

Work with the profession

Yet another approach, and a good second step after establishing the certification concept, would be for Government to convene a national study commission, set the agenda, and allow a process of collaborative planning to ensue. This strategy would accomplish many of the same ends: putting certification on the agenda, getting the parties involved, and throwing the weight of government behind the initiative. There are precedents for these

actions. Hughes and other (1981), in their study of training in Britain, argued for central, but co-operative, action by Government and providers, when they wrote:

> [A national initiative]can best be sustained over a period of time through the creation of an executive agency which is given specific responsibility for promoting the expansion and improvement of professional development provision in England and Wales. The proposed agency might appropriately be designated the School Management Unit (SMU), and would operate partly by providing support and assistance, as required, to existing professional development activity of proven worth, and partly more directly by acting with others to stimulate and help create new co-operative patterns of professional development provision in different parts of England and Wales. (Hughes et al., 1981)

Shortly thereafter, the Secretary of State did promulgate DES Circular 3/83 which made provision for release of teachers on long courses (Poster, 1987), though now due to the restructuring of INSET funding, these programmes are under threat.

It seems essential, as we have argued, that the Government should take a strong lead in establishing certification, but that it should not become the main controller of the process, nor the primary funding agency. As mentioned earlier, it is time that administrative trainees, and their professional associations (old or newly-constituted) take control. Waiting for Government funding — and responding every time the amounts change — is hardly a base on which to build a stable training effort. *Private initiative may be the only long-term answer if sustained, universal preparation and certification are to be possible.*

The key group in the training process is the senior LEA and school staff themselves, the heads, deputy heads, inspectors, advisers and officers. Their role is critical in upgrading the profession and pressing on with the process of certification. If heads and prospective heads were to see certification as just another government requirement, then they might resist it, especially if they had to spend money to get the training. If, on the other hand, certification were seen as a way of controlling entry into the profession, of upgrading performance, and of gaining the kind of professional status, accorded to doctors, lawyers, and architects, then it could well gain general acceptance.

School administrators in Britain should seize the initiative and work closely with government, LEAs, and management trainers in establishing high-quality programmes and see that certification is available to all new heads by, say, 1993, and to all others by at least the end of the century.

4. Certification: the academic programmes

A most interesting and problematic step in the certification of school administrators is the nature of the training programmes themselves: their curricula, activities, philosophy, pedagogy, and theoretical approaches. This area has been well discussed in the literature, since it involves the academic community in a very central and profound way. The actual content of training courses may well be the 'bread and butter' of academic life — its actions, methods, research paradigms, and research output.

As we described in Chapter Two, in the 'one best model' American school administration gained credibility as an academic discipline, mainly through the theory movement (Crowson and McPherson, 1987) and the application of the behavioural sciences to the study of school management. But while academic respectability is one thing, training effective school managers is another. While philosophers and historians may ignore the practical implications of their theorizing, those who prepare leaders in education cannot, for long! Thus, a watchword of school preparation programmes, and their intellectual underpinnings, is the much used (over-used) term 'theory into practice', that is, application of conceptual models to 'real-life' situations and problems, and the needs of field administrators.

This dichotomy of theorizing and managing raises fundamental questions about the design of preparation programmes. First, is there any theory of school management? Secondly, what effect do theories have on practices in schools, and how best might concepts of management be taught? It reminds us of the joke about what professors of education administration do: they see if what happens in schools will work in theory. Yet, if Britain is to move with energy to prepare the next generation of school leaders (and we hope to license them), then certainly some attention must be paid to the state of the art in management theory and how it is taught (and practised) in training programmes.

There is at present little agreement on what school administrators should learn on their courses. If, however, certification is to be required over the next decade or so in Britain, we might appropriately ask: what should prospective school leaders be taught and be expected to do? And how best might these goals be reached? Perhaps the following typology of course content will be useful, arranged on a continuum from facts and knowledge at one end to concepts and theories at the other, from the concrete to the abstract.

Knowledge of job and resources

There are basic facts, laws, and information that every administrator should

master and which make the job more effective. Names of staff, location of equipment, where to call for information, what legal stipulations there are for handling funds in the school, for disciplining a student, reprimanding a teacher who is chronically late, etc. There is a long and constantly changing list of information to be mastered.

Much of this factual data must be learned on the job, and is hardly worthy of certification. Such basic knowledge needs to accumulate very rapidly for, without it, school leaders are doomed. In fact, newcomers to management posts sometimes find that others 'hide' vital information from them, as a way of sabotaging their chances of success; aspirants in the school who felt they should have been appointed head might say, 'Let them find out for themselves; I know it all, and they passed me over for the post.' A joke in the New York City public school system is that an outsider taking the Chancellor's (chief officer) post would take months just to find the men's (women's) room. And as a result of the isolation, few chancellors have been appointed from outside the system. Those who come from outside, not surprisingly, have not lasted more than a few years (Rogers, 1969; Ravitch, 1974).

Perhaps, short workshops would be good sources of knowledge for trainees, where concise, useful information could be disseminated about new programmes, laws, procedures, etc. And any examination for certification for school administrators would undoubtedly contain some testing for vital information without which a new head could not function. But certification is hardly based on facts alone.

Skills and processes

Much training now, in universities and LEAs, is centred on teaching administrators the basic skills and processes of leadership in schools. In part, this activity grows from research on what heads actually *do* and how to prepare people for the job. Scholars have systematically watched the 'man in the principal's office' (Wolcott, 1977) to see what skills and processes heads require in the day-to-day environment of the school and how schools are improved (Blumberg and Greenfield, 1980). The activities and skills thus identified can then be incorporated into training (Mintzberg, 1973; Blumberg, 1984; Morris et al., 1984).

Attempts have been made over the years to describe the skills and processes an effective leader requires. Henri Fayol (1841-1925), the French mining engineer (it seems that all early management theorists were engineers), defined administration as striving to *plan, organize, command, co-ordinate,* and *control* (Gulick and Urwick, 1937). Gulick had his unpronounceable

POSD-CoRB, an acronym for the seven administrative functions: *planning*, *organizing*, *staffing*, *directing*, *co-ordinating*, *reporting*, and *budgeting*. Modern courses in management in education and industry still include these skills, and lessons proceed through each of them in turn.

Perhaps one of the best description of what managers do, and of their roles in the organization is Henry Mintzberg's *The Nature of Managerial Work* (1973), based on a microanalysis of the working lives of a small number of top corporate leaders. He found that managers had three main roles: *interpersonal*, *informational* and *decisional*, which broke down into nineteen skill areas:

> **Interpersonal:** (1) ceremonial figurehead; (2) formal leadership; (3) motivator, (4) control, (5) liaison, (6) problem-solver.
>
> **Informational:** (7) spokesperson; (8) consultation, (9) focus and filter, (10) monitoring, (11) dissemination.
>
> **Decisional:** (12) disturbance handler, (13) systems maintenance, (14) negotiation, (15) arbitration, (16) resource allocation, (17) task organizer, (18) initiate development projects, and (19) long-term planning.

Note the continuing appearance of the basic functions of the executive, including (4) control, (10) monitoring, (11) resource allocation, and (19) planning, all of which were on lists by Fayol and Gulick. In the United States recently, John Hoyle (1985) attempted to catalogue the important management competencies and related skills, though his list became so long, overlapping, and incoherent that it is somewhat limited as a teaching tool. He, too, included such skills as the capacity to diagnose, design, improve instruction, allocate resources and evaluate programmes.

British scholars of administration have also looked at the functions and roles (Burgoyne and Stuart, 1978) and the skills and competencies (Dean, 1985) that managers, including headteachers, require. For example, Audrey Jackson, herself a headteacher, has ranked the functions of school leaders, from priorities such as (1) 'producing, maintaining, and developing a school philosophy' and (2) 'consultation and communication systems', through (15) 'financial control'. Everard (1986) has his own ten key skill areas for training heads, including, for example, leadership, setting objectives/setting priorities (not unlike planning), problem-solving, effecting change, planning (again), staff development (staffing, by another name?), and so on.

Whatever skills one considers, it seems important that a licensing programme pay attention to them. Since most school leaders must do some

planning, some implementation, problem-solving, communicating and evaluating, these processes should be learned, though in and of themselves they are, like facts, best learned by doing. The function of a training programme, then, would be to expose participants to the importance of these skills, to demonstrate how they might be accomplished and, perhaps most importantly, to give ample opportunity to trainees to practise these procedures in a supportive group setting. Here is where the American experience is a good negative example, since university classrooms alone are not the best place to learn how to plan, to execute, to mediate, to compromise, to communicate, to change schools and to improve them.

Instead, an *integrated* experience, between field and university, between classroom/workshop and real-life settings in schools and industry is preferable to a purely academic setting. Our experience has been that teaching 'planning', for example, is tedious and banal. 'Doing' planning, in a group, with real goals, questions, problems, roles, processes, ends, and results can be a sobering, yet at the same time a heady, almost intoxicating, experience. While one stares at one's watch during a lecture on 'incremental planning processes', time flies when one is wrangling with colleagues over how best to change the purpose, structure, staff, budgeting and supervisory systems in one's own school.

Thus, training and certification programmes in Britain, to be successful, should involve co-operative experiences across institutional barriers, where students of management learn and practise their craft in situations as close to reality as possible. This integrated approach might avoid, in Michael Usdan's words, the situation in which students 'learn *about* administration' rather than 'learn to administer' (Glatter, 1972, p.67). But which exact skills and processes should administrators learn? No list can be exact or definitive, though experience seems to show that knowing how to communicate, to motivate, to supervise, to plan and execute, are nearly universal requirements of school leaders — and can be taught and practised during a certification programme. If one examines the challenges to top school management, as reflected in a survey of 1971 and 1982 in the United States (Cunningham and Hentges, 1982, p.60), a number of key skill areas emerge. They include, number one, *financing schools* (top of both 1971 and 1982 rankings); number two in 1982, *planning and goal setting*, and three, *assessing educational outcomes* (see Table 7). These major concerns, it seems to us, can be taught as skills and processes — and would make exciting challenges to practitioners and trainees, working with university scholars and researchers.

Certification programmes, then, should include an emphasis on preparing school heads, deputies, senior staff, inspectors and officers, to understand

the values and skills that line administrators need and on seeing that they are included in training. Many of these challenges are large enough to necessitate group responses; teamwork and other devices are necessary. This takes us into the next level of concern in training: concepts and theory.

Concepts and theory

The training of school senior staff has been strongly influenced by the increasing importance of the social and behavioural sciences in analysing school management and administration. The so-called 'theory movement' in administration began in the 1920s with 'scientific management' (Taylor, 1947; Gulick and Urwick, 1937; Roethlisberger and Dickson, 1939), continued from concerns for the 'executive function' (Barnard, 1938) within formal, complex organizations (March and Simon, 1958; Simon, 1947) to more contemporary paradigms of organizations as adaptive (Hersey and Blanchard, 1982; Fiedler, 1973), political (Bacharach and Lawler, 1980; Pfeffer and Salancik, 1983) and cultural systems (Deal and Kennedy, 1982; Sergiovanni and Corbally, 1984; Schön, 1984).

In educational administration, this theory movement hit home in the 1950s, with the direct application of 'social-scientific' (Erickson, 1979) theory to the practice of school management. Students on graduate courses in administration were expected to master not only the facts and techniques of their craft (e.g., planning, leadership, change, supervision) but also the theoretical/conceptual view of these processes as well. In fact, Crowson and McPherson claim that the theory movement

> grew directly from a dissatisfaction with the 'old tradition' in the field — a tendency to pursue naked, non-theoretical empiricism at best and to offer inadequately field tested 'principles' of efficient administration at the worst (for example, span-of-control and POSD-CoRB). (Crowson and McPherson 1987, p.47. See also Culbertson, 1981; Getzels, Lipham, and Campbell, 1968)

Theory, it was believed, would have a profound effect on school management: its performance, training, and research. And it did (Griffiths, 1964; 1966). It brought the practices of administrators in schools into the same research traditions and methodologies as other areas of the 'management sciences', though the exact way in which these theories affected practice is another question.

In part, the problem was that theory was concerned with making conceptual sense out of the behaviour of educators (particularly, leaders) in typical or modal situations, while real-life, red-blooded administrators

Table 7: Superintendents' Ranking of Issues and Challenges Facing the Superintendency, 1982

Issues and Challenges	*National Weighted Profile*		*Group A: 25,000 or more*		*Group B: 3,000–24,999*		*Group C: 300–2,999*		*Group D: less than 300 pupils*		*National Unweighted Profile*	
	Rank	*%*	*Rank*	*%*	*Rank*	*%*	*Rank*	*%*	*Rank*	*%*	*Rank*	*%*
Financing Schools	1	94.4	1	94.6	1	96.4	1	95.6	1	88.3	1	94.6
Planning and goal setting	2	77.5	4	86.2	3	83.4	2	77.4	2	70.0	2.5	78.7
Assessing educational outcomes	3	76.9	2	91.0	2	86.7	3	77.3	5	62.2	2.5	78.7
Accountability/credibility	4	73.8	3	88.0	6	78.3	4	74.6	4	64.7	4	75.2
Staff and administrator evaluation	5	72.2	8	78.9	5	79.5	5	73.0	6	60.2	5	73.4
Administrator/board relations	6	71.5	6	81.7	8	73.4	6	71.3	3	69.0	6	72.5
Special education/Public Law 94-142	7	70.6	7	79.8	4	80.9	7	70.6	9	56.6	7	72.1
Obtaining timely and accurate information for decision making	8	68.1	5	85.3	7	75.7	8	69.0	11	54.7	8	70.1
Issues such as negotiations, strikes	9	62.9	9	76.5	9	72.5	9	66.2	16	39.6	9	64.7
Rapidly decreasing/ increasing/enrollments	10	60.9	15	66.6	10	64.8	10	60.3	8	57.2	10	61.6

Greater visibility of the superintendent	11	59.2	13	68.8	11	64.3	11	59.1	14	52.5	11	60.5
Personal time management	12	58.1	16	62.0	14	59.8	13	58.7	12	54.1	12	58.5
Parent apathy and irresponsibility about their own children — including child abuse	13	57.6	19	52.7	18	54.2	12	59.0	7	57.9	13	56.7
Compliance with state and federal record keeping requirements	14	54.5	20	52.3	19	52.6	14	54.9	10	56.1	15	54.3
Student discipline	15	54.1	18	57.9	17	54.3	15	54.8	15	50.9	14	55.0
Staff recruitment/selection	16	51.7	17	58.7	20	49.2	18	51.8	13	53.9	19	52.0
Changes in values and behavioral norms	17	51.5	14	67.9	15	59.4	16.5	52.2	18	38.2	17	53.4
Use of drugs and alcohol in the schools	18	51.2	12	70.6	13	60.9	16.5	52.2	20	34.1	18	53.3
Community involvement in school district decision making	19	50.7	10	74.3	12	62.0	19	49.5	17	38.7	16	53.5
Changing priorities in curriculum such as "Back to Basics", black studies courses or sex education	20	48.6	11	71.9	16	57.1	20	48.1	19	37.8	29	51.0

The American School Superintendency. Reproduced with permission of the American Association of School Administrators.

were concerned with what to do in the particular, fast-moving environment of a school. Theory was theory; practice, practice. A favourite concern in applied fields like management is the 'theory into practice' paradigm, in attempting to overcome the 'tensions' between social scientific findings and real-life managerial needs and problems (Halpin, 1966). Hughes (1985), after reviewing the development of theory in the United States and Britain, argued that 'the tensions between theory and practice in educational management and in cognate areas of applied social science shows little sign of abating . . .' But, he continues, this tension can 'be dynamic and creative, leading to deeper understanding and to a consequent improvement in the practice of educational management. May it alway be so' (p.33).

What could be learned by practitioners in the field, however, was a way of approaching the world, of reflecting-in-action (Schön, 1984), of problem-solving, of reconceptualizing common practices. Crowson and McPherson (1987) summarize the contribution of the theory movement to education administration training and practice as follows:

> Thus, although the Theory Movement failed to appreciate adequately what life was really like in schools and failed to give ready answers to practical questions, the inculcation of a formative orientation may have been a powerful force of administrator training. Not very tangible, difficult to describe, and hard to identify as an element of the formal curriculum, nevertheless, a certain cognitive style, a peculiar approach to problem solving, and a sense of the normative may be among the most important of the legacies from a brief period of intellectual excitement in educational administration. (p.51)

What has happened over a period of time, however, is that thoughtful people have come to realize that formal training in theoretical ways of looking at schools as organizations with unique behavioural, cultural and political qualities, at the behaviour and attitudes of people in these institutions, and the interaction of setting and 'actors', is not stable and determinate, as assumed in the technical-rational scientific paradigm (Schön, 1983). If Schön's argument is correct, the way we look at education and training of educational leaders should be based on a new, more real-to-life, paradigm. Instead of assuming that knowledge is stable and school settings and conditions determinate, we should realize that we must *construct* knowledge and that settings and conditions are indeterminate and value-filled. Because of the nature of education, he suggests the notion of reflective practice built upon assumptions that 'rules' must be derived from reflective action. Readers may be interested also in Eisner's (1985) arguments with the scientific and

technical paradigm upon which we presently base most of our educational practice.

Be that as it may, perhaps the major contribution of theory to practice is that a conceptual view, in the words of McPherson, Crowson, and Pitner (1986),

> . . . generates problems, questions, hypotheses. It points to certain data sources. It assists in the analysis of data. It helps describe what exists. It aids in the making of decisions. And, revised, it encourages the raising of further problems, questions and hypotheses. This is enough. (p.22)

In so doing, theory and concepts become important tools of the active administrator, not so much to answer questions as to raise them, not so much to direct action as to question and organize it. But theory alone is not enough, at least for school senior staff. It must also relate to practice. It is extremely important, then, in seeking to prepare and perhaps to licence administrators, that as much *application* of theory as possible be achieved. Glatter states it nicely:

> The danger of concentrating on skills and techniques is that this will reinforce the view of the administrator as primarily a technician, a machine-man concerned above all to ensure that the decisions of others are carried out as smoothly as possible, or that what has always been done continues to be done, only more efficiently . . . 'raw', unsystematized experience is not a relatively less helpful guide than it used to be, and a conceptual grasp of the wider issues, roles, and relationships involved in educational administration is of increasing importance to the administrator. But this does not alter the fundamental contention, that *such deeper understanding, no less than skills and techniques, must be transmitted through the medium of concrete administrative situations rather than predominately in the 'classroom' settings.* (Glatter, 1972, pp.9-10, author's italic)

Nowhere, then, is the integrated approach to conceptualizing, training, and licensing more important than in the apt use of theory in informing practice in school management. Virtually everyone agrees, from James March back in 1958, who noted then 'the persistent difficulties with programmes for reform of the training of administrators . . . that are far removed from the ordinary organization of managerial life' (March, 1958, p.38), to most recent conclusions, that disembodied theory, taught in the sterile, false environment of the university classroom, is useless. Instead, most agree that training institutions, learning practitioners, scholars, government, businesses, communities, must co-operate in attacking school

problems in their native habitat: the school, the classroom, at the chalkface. Nancy J. Pitner aptly explains the integral relationships between training, setting, and theory:

> A university could collaborate with the state's professional association or school district to offer a programme that would fit the content, domain, and sequence of administrator training needed at the master's or credential level. Thus, a student might spend the summer at the university taking administration courses in the intellectual domain but during the school year participate in simulations that link theory to practice or attend workshops that train administrators in less cognitive, skill-oriented material relevant to the position for which certification is desired. Graduate credit would be earned in all cases. (Pitner, 1987, p.94)

In sum, the quality of training programmes — their teaching of relevant knowledge, skills, and theory — is critical to any preparation and certification programme. Glatter ended his 1972 study of training with these 'guidelines':

> 1. To avoid 'jerry-built' curricula, the institutions providing programmes need staff sufficiently adaptable to concern themselves with the total objectives and effectiveness of a training programme; whatever their own disciplines and experience, the criteria for the selection of content and method must be its validity in terms of students' needs.
> 2. Resources are urgently needed for the creation of new learning situations and teacher materials in the context of British educational administration, developed co-operatively by institutions providing programmes and local authorities, schools, colleges, and national agencies. (Glatter, 1972, p.70)

In the United States school administration preparation and certification have been criticized as anaemic, unchallenging and of poor academic quality (Peterson and Finn, 1985; Cooper and Boyd, 1987). Doing it well (better) in Britain will depend in part on presenting the latest concepts in an applied and engaging way. The closer to the source, the nexus, of school problems, the better the learning experience.

Why could not a training institution 'adopt' a local school, its strengths and weaknesses, its staff, students, and resources, and then attack its problems? Why not involve the school community, businesses, external resources, in the process? Surely it is better to tackle real situations and involve the people in them than to sit in a university lecture hall and talk *about* effective school management and problem-solving?

Such integration of course content, course activities, institutions, people, and problems comes much closer to the ideal. Already, we see signs of close

collaboration between higher education institutions, senior staff, and schools. Such integration around real situations engages all those it touches. It energizes the management learning process. It emphasizes the latest concept of school performance and administration, showing indeed that leadership depends on understanding schools as political, cultural, value-laden, particularistic settings, and requires the best preparation, the latest information, the widest array of skills and the ready application of management and organizational theories, all focused on making schools better living and learning environments for children.

Chapter Four

Certification
The Future

> Clearly, the need for training in education management and for coherent management development strategies at all levels of the educational system have only lately begun to be widely recognized in the United Kingdom. Nevertheless, if the present degree of awareness and effort can be maintained and adequately resourced, one may be reasonably confident that there will be improvement in the quality of our schooling. That, after all, is the crucial aim. (Poster 1987, p.52)

So far, we have made a case for the licensing of school heads and other senior staff along the following lines. (1) Other professionals (lawyers, doctors, architects, etc.) control their own certification and to some extent their own training, examining and setting of disciplinary standards. (2) Certification would be the best device for improving the preparation and quality of leaders of Britain's schools over the next decade and beyond. It would extend training to all by placing candidates for management posts on notice that they are responsible for their own professional career development. Though government, local education authorities, and school governors have a significant interest in this training and need to help as much as possible financially and programmatically, getting certificted would primarily be the responsibility of the individual educator. (3) Certification would focus attention on the needs of school managers, and would bring the parties in the process together to formulate policies, to establish programmes, and to get the approximately 150,000 school senior staff in Britain trained and certificated. And (4), with the present Government intent on giving schools more authority over their own budgets, programmes, staffing, and management, senior staff will need better preparation and support.

So far, too, we have explained some of the steps that are likely to be necessary for improving training and developing a certification programme

in Britain; many of these steps are already being taken and should be extended.

The Secretary of State, acting with professional associations in education and business, might set the agenda, by appointing a national commission to discuss certification and by announcing dates for the introduction of training and certification.

Acting on the advice of local authorities, school senior staff, teachers, business and industry, universities and other providers, the Government would initiate action to work out the logistics of certification such as following:

1. Form a national certification entity.

The Government should co-operate with other agencies in setting standards and issuing certificates to school heads, officers, advisers and inspectors with responsibility for school management affairs. We have suggested the creation of a Society of School Administrators (SSA) to be the official certification body in Great Britain with a School Administrator Accreditation Board (SAAB) set up under its direction actually to administer licensing procedures.

2. Establish experiences and courses.

A set of training and professional experiences, completed in university, school, LEA, and business settings, should be used to allow trainees to gain the widest possible experience and to use the training resources already located in these diverse management environments.

3. Determine modules and credits.

Crucial to the process is the flexibility of course offerings and experience. By 'modularizing' the programmes, and by assigning 'credits' to these experiences, candidates for the certificate can continue to work in schools and find time in the evenings, weekends, holidays, and time-release for staff (pre-service and in-service as well as full-time for the lucky few), to study and practise educational administration in a range of settings. Many 'providers' are already recognizing that 'long courses' and degree courses are less attractive to busy administrators-in-training and prefer shorter, discrete units, through modules; the credits, then, must be attached somehow to the modules.

4. Bring co-operating parties together.

From our experience, and from what we have seen in Britain, training institutions are already co-operating with authorities, schools, and professional groups to work on training. This co-operation makes effective preparation possible; it also means that students may gain the benefit of learning in various settings, from various local and regional groups.

5. Establish an integrated content.

The content of training courses is crucial. These learning activities should bring together theory and practice, learning and doing, work in university and school settings, abstract ideas and practical advice in a dynamic training programme. Two further steps are:

Internship. Certification should require at least a one-year experience in a school (it may not be the intern's own school), in a job which is not the candidate's normal work and under supervision of the (certificated) school head and (as supervisor) the university lecturer in charge of the course.

Probationary Licensure. Another check on quality and preparation would be to hold back the permanent licence until satisfactory completion of a first year. This would help to enforce quality control, giving the licence a practical accrediting function, as well as a testimony to the training experience (time, credits, courses).

Unlike the American 'one best model', which tends to suffer from a case of 'credit-itis', and is unduly controlled by the universities and the state, the possibilities in Britain for a truly integrated model are perhaps higher. Training in Britain, then, should have the following characteristics.

Integration across time. Students would be given an extended period of time to allow them to study while they work and to learn as they go. Since the vast majority of those needing the training and the licence are already working in education, candidates should be allowed to accumulate the credits necessary for certification over a long period of time, say two to five years, as their schedules and responsibilities, needs and interests, dictate.

Integration across places and agencies. The use of 'mods' (modules) and credits (recall CAT: credit accumulation and transfer) would allow flexibility in preparation, settings, and experiences. Rather than limit training to the university classroom, as the American model typically does, the British system might deliberately place trainees in a variety of settings: certainly the *university* for theory, research, and didactic presentations; certainly *schools* for internships, practice, application; but also *commerce and industry* for learning finance and programme-budgeting, *local education authorities* for sharing experience, and regional *seminars* and *workshops* for staying in touch, and creating and maintaining collegial networks.

Close co-operation between schools and other sources of training would mean that business people might be seconded into schools to help management and fund raising; public relations firms would be excellent places to learn marketing skills; and research institutions might be appropriate places to study how technology can be better used in schools. Already, we see this kind of inter-agency co-operation in setting up the first

city technology college, where local industry is helping the headteacher and school's governors to get the school in operation by September 1988.

Integrating theory and practice. Finally, training which combines the field and the university has the potential of bringing theory and practice together. Nothing makes theory more real than a 'field test' to see if, indeed, practitioners conceive of the world and behave as the theorists posit. Theorists sharpen their concepts, categories, and hypotheses by spending time in schools, classrooms, and systems. Practitioners, too, can benefit from re-conceptualizing their roles, their schools as institutions, and their functions as leaders.

Scenario

But how will it work? Will anything happen? Or will the slow decline in training opportunities continue as Government and LEA funds are moved around and providers chase students in this mysterious new 'marketplace' where there is little money, no currency of exchange, no banks to invest in, and most importantly, few national training goals to be gained? What follows is an 'imaginary but realistic' scenario (see Bridges, 1986, pp. 124 ff), of what might happen, should Britain go towards a certification system for school leaders. This is purposely an optimistic, positive glimpse into the future. Why be pessimistic? After all, a good definition of a pessimist is someone who, when opportunity knocks, complains about the noise. We shall mention the key decision-points, and then take the high road, assuming the best, as a way of pulling the certification debate together in a realistic fashion.

Stage 1: 'Certification is suggested'

Mr Kenneth Baker, Secretary of State for Education, announces his commitment to training for senior school staff. In the Government discussion paper on training, he explains: 'The success of our entire education agenda depends on heads, deputies, heads of departments, and governors who are willing and able to take control of their schools, to be good financial managers, and to lead their schools to improved teaching and learning'.

Mr Baker takes two concrete steps. First, he asks that those working as leaders in schools look ahead to formal training, leading to an administrator's licence. Second, he appoints a National Committee on School Management Training, which includes representatives of the profession, the Government, business, institutions of higher education, management consultants, and local education authorities. The mandate of the committee includes five goals:

1. To survey the needs and resources for training senior staff in education in Britain;
2. To look at systems of providing new training, especially ways of 'modularizing' the training experience so that school managers-in-training can find convenient, high quality programmes while carrying on with their careers;
3. To investigate the creation of a 'credit' system, including the number of credits necessary for degrees, diplomas, and certificates; the hour equivalents; and the experiences which might be 'credit bearing';
4. To recommend levels of management certification, for leaders holding various posts in schools and local authorities, the inspectorate and advisory personnel; and
5. To investigate the possibility of creating a licensing agency outside the Department of Education and Science, on the model of institutes or societies of engineers, physicians, architects, solicitors, representing the needs of the profession of school management.

The response in the press is mixed and indicative. A headteacher writing in *The Times Educational Supplement* queries: 'Yes, training's a great idea, but who will pay for it? And who will cover our jobs while we go off for courses and workshops? And will they pay us more if we're "licensed" and take our jobs away if we aren't?' Another headteacher is heard to comment that 'here goes the Secretary of State again, but now he's "privatizing" the training of school managers since we know he's not paying for all of us to go back to school'.

Groups, such as the British Education Management and Administration Society (BEMAS), are quick to give cautious support. Professor Hickenlooper in a letter to the Secretary of State offers the full co-operation of the department of educational administration at her university in designing the course of study, determining the credit equivalents, and helping to set up a Society of School Administrators. She judges that, whether the Government, local authorities or individual administrator-trainees pay for the courses, the chance to train a portion of the some 150,000 eligible administrators — not to mention new people seeking these posts over the next decade — is a 'window of opportunity' for universities and polytechnics.

Speaking for an association of local authorities, an officer writes in *The Guardian* that the LEAs in his group are fully behind the effort to extend training to all school professionals, including management training for their senior staff. If the Government would only give the LEAs more funding, they could expand their INSET budgets and offer more courses. The idea of credits, modules, and flexibility is great, he says, but 'certification may not be neccessary'.

A Labour Party spokesperson, in the 'Platform' section of *The Times Educational Supplement*, wonders again why Mr Baker and the Party of

local choice and devolution of authority are acting now to force the nation's beleaguered school leaders to go back to school. A cartoon shows the headteacher's office door bearing a sign saying , 'Sorry, gone out for a licence. Be back in two years. You may reach me in the university library'.

A spokesperson for the Institute of Directors commends the Secretary of State for bringing management to schools. He offers to share resources, host management trainees, and to second corporate managers to schools to work closely with heads on such things as finance, marketing, computer-assisted management, new management information systems (MIS), and staff development. He explains that many corporations are already helping with school management through links with local authorities ('partnerships') and through sponsorship and administrative support for city technology colleges.

Stage 2: 'Circular 3/89 is promulgated'

The Committee on School Management Training is composed of twenty people from education, business, government, universities, and the public. It submits its report to the Secretary of State, with the findings that many school senior staff feel inadequate for their jobs, that training is neither readily available to all, nor is it coherent, sustained enough, or relevant to the challenges of their jobs.

The Committee urges universal training of administrators and managers in education, with certification seen as a possible means for setting the seal on training and establishing standards. It recommends that training be carried out by the profession itself and be regulated by them, not necessarily by the Department of Education and Science. It suggests the following:

- that training be as flexible as possible, to avoid undue hardship on trainees and to help preparation fit into job schedules;
- that local partnership for the purpose of training between trainees and universities, LEAs, business, and government, be encouraged;
- that training be relevant to the needs of the job and school improvement;
- that the professionalism of school heads, and other senior staff be extended through improved research, development and training.

On the agenda is the necessity of certification itself and what agency should take responsibility for it. When it becomes obvious that the Secretary of State might require training, over a period of years, for new and experienced senior staff, the Committee recommends that administrators' associations (e.g., the National Association of Headteachers) seize the initiative and establish a Society of School Administrators, with broad support, to set

criteria for certification including:

1. Modules and credits.

Eight credits earned from, say, 16 modules of training make a candidate eligible to apply for certification (those with master's degrees in education administration or other management fields, can enter for an internship and be immediately eligible).

2. Agents and training.

Competition is encouraged amongst providers, using current training sources: universities, polytechnics, institutions of higher education, LEAs, consulting groups, and associations. Courses, programmes, modules, workshops, and practical experiences are to be reviewed by the School Administrator Accreditation Board of the new Society, in co-operation with the Department of Education and Science.

3. Costs and payments.

The report of the Committee, and subsequent efforts of the Society indicate that the responsibility for getting licensed rests with the candidates themselves, though every effort will be made to keep costs to them down and to help out with public resources.

Commissioners estimate that on average a trainee will have to pay about £1,000 for total training, which includes a degree or diploma, a practicum/internship, and the certificate itself, though some may pay much less and some all of the costs. Getting a certificate, furthermore, does not guarantee a job as an administrator, though not having one probably weakens the candidate's chances.

In *Circular 3/89*, the Secretary of State lays out the requirements for training, based on the Committee's report. Avoiding a highly centralizing and bureaucratic approach, he wisely sets out the goals of training and certification for all school senior staff and encourages the profession, working with government, to establish a Society of School Administrators to set standards for training and practice, to review applications, and to act as the final arbiter in cases of poor management practice.

Stage 3: Candidate Jones seeks a school management career

Mrs Marjory Jones has been a biology teacher in two different comprehensive schools during her nine years in education. She has been moving into administration for about three years, finding herself supervising the writing of curricula, organizing groups of students who want advanced work in science, and becoming the head of department in 1987. She has attended six LEA workshops on school management and when her school became part of the Devolution Revolution in 1989, she took on more

responsibility as part of the financial management team of her school, Broughton High School.

Her speciality, it seems, is helping to translate the school's education goals into managerial objectives and financial costs. The programme planning and budgeting skills, which she learned at a three-day workshop, have stood her and her school in good stead, as programme goals (e.g., expanding science units for students with special educational needs; establishing advanced programmes for the gifted; putting career awareness, technology, and job preparation into the fifth-form programme) take shape andrequire budgets to make them work.

When Mr Kenneth Baker warned that certification was coming n 1989, Mrs Jones took stock of her needs and of her background. Fom six workshops, she estimates she has accumulated two credits. Her iew job as deputy head for programme and curriculum (there are three other leputies for pupil pastoral services, administration, and staff development allows her to apply to waive the internship requirement (and to gain anoner two credits). She is half-way to a certificate without taking any extendel study, though she feels the need for a heavy-duty course of study in a university where she hopes that she will get: (1.) contact with other trainees likeherself, particularly men and women who are moving into secondary school management posts; (2.) exposure to some management theory, since(as she reads journals and books on management, leadership and administration) she feels lacking in basic knowledge and insights; (3.) chances o build contacts with a network of colleagues in business (where she knows there are good ideas and money for schools), universities, consulting firms, other LEAs and other schools; (4.) opportunities to get away from the iolation of the school and to encounter new ideas on education.

She approaches her head, who has some INSET money for a three-term course of study at the Institute of Education, University of London which carries two more credits, plus a summer institute run by Lougton Electronics, a regional industry, for management training, a chance to work alngside corporate management trainers, jointly taught by the Institute of Education and the London Business School. Within a year, she will have te eight credits, and will have had to pay only £500 herself for the courses f study, a small amount considering that her first headship will more tha make up for the costs.

In 1990, she sends off to the Society of School Administrators (SA) an application for a certificate at secondary level. She indicates on te form that she has a degree in biology, a postgraduate certificate in ducation, 11 years of teaching experience, and good reviews on her work.On the

'training section', she indicates the workshops, times, titles, locations, and names of tutors; the year's training at the University, with the modules, credits, and marks for her work; the management seminars in local industry; and, the two-years as head of department and one year as deputy head at Broughton High School.

The Society also asks for three letters of recommendation and permission to send a visiting committee to her school to look at her work, to talk with her superiors, colleagues, fellow teachers, and governors. She also learns that there will be a certificate examination, including some questions about her job, her approach to leadership, her ability to solve a simulated, real-life problem in a secondary school, and her use of two current management theories. The examination does not worry her. Her wide experience, her work in university, schools, and industry, and her network of friends and colleagues make her confident that she can pass most sections of the test (there are five and each part can be taken three times). She discusses the coming examination with colleagues, a lecturer from her course of study at the university, and her head (who passed it himself just last month).

The Society has set up a 'study course' for the examination, and 75 administrators and trainees show up in the 'secondary school' section (there are also sections for primary school management, LEA management for education officers, and further and higher education management). Altogether, Mrs Jones has clocked over 250 hours of training in management, supervision, planning, budgeting and programming, and passes the certificate examination, which makes her eligible now to seek a headship and to have her own school.

She has learned much from her own head, Mr Calvin Allen, who has worked hard at building a strong team management within the school, including senior and junior staff, parents, governors, and students. His 'leadership style' fits in nicely with devolved management, shared decision-making, theories of management taught in workshops and university classes, and with Mrs Jones's predisposition to share ideas, get 'input from others' and use the resources in her own school, and from the network she has joined during training.

Stage 4: A primary school case

Mr Richard Pickford has been headteacher of a 445-student primary school in the suburbs of London for seven years. When the Government required training, Pickford was 'sitting pretty'. He had a master's degree in school administration, which provided more than enough credits towards certification. Since he has been deputy head, acting head, and headteacher,

he could get the 'internship' waived — and easily get a certificate. No problem.

In fact, he sees the need for training and education of senior staff as a great opportunity. He calls the president of his heads' association and suggests that the group make contact with the polytechnic where Pickford received his MA, and that the association, the polytechnic, and LEA training staff co-operate in putting on classes, workshops, and projects for fellow staff. One of his parent governors is vice president of a local printing concern, who offers the training effort £10,000, on top of government and individual funding, to cover training materials, staff support, telephone, and other costs.

Furthermore, Pickford is thinking about asking the polytechnic if he can work with staff, to teach other heads to be in-service trainers, along the line of some of the early OTTO work. When the word gets out he receives queries from his own LEA staff, and from regional centres, since everyone is needing some up-grading of work or wants to start the certification process. In a year Pickford is seconded from his headship to the LEA office, where he devotes all his time to work with heads, preparing others who want to become staff leaders, and teaching at the polytechnic with a senior lecturer two evenings a week.

Whilst this scenario is necessarily general and speculative, it does give a sense of what might lie ahead. At Stage 1, we see the politics of trying to get the parties to agree to go for certification; Stage 2 gives a taste of what is involved and the need for a common ground for training; Stage 3 takes the personal case history, of a woman using the certification process for her own (and her school's) benefit.

Many observers of school and innovation in the last decade have commented upon the importance of good leadership in making school improvements. Certainly Britain, with its radical school reforms in the 1960s under comprehensive reorganization and the recent attempts to offer choice, competition, and variety through the devolution of authority to schools, must again look to its school leadership to make schools better for students. Institutionalizing innovation, and along with it training, then becomes a central requirement for school staff. As one group of writers explain,

> Leaders must exercise the same initiative at state, provincial and national levels. To do so, they may have to work together to form a critical mass so that the impact of their views has enough weight to influence educational direction setting. Currently, leaders are neither expected nor trained to engage in this type of

collaborative leadership. Training programmes of the future should recognize and accept this challenge. (Leithwood et al., 1987, p.190)

Great Britain has the chance to do it better than other nations which currently license school administrators. We are proposing a middle ground, where certification is insisted on but the bureaucratic procedures that pervade much training in other countries are avoided. If Britain uses a flexible credit and modular approach — a variety of universities and other training sites, a theory-into-practice integrated approach — it will be able to avoid some of the rigidity of the 'one best model' of training now seen in the United States.

The stakes are high. Preparing school leaders for the rest of the century and beyond should be a national priority, and in a sense it already is. What is missing so far is a means, a process. This volume suggests mandatory certification as a central part of that process. Certification may well give the spark and direction needed to current efforts to prepare school heads, deputies, inspectors, advisors, and officers in Britain for the challenges of education leadership.

References

Adams, N. (1987), *Secondary School Management Today*. London: Hutchinson.

Albright, A.B. (1986), 'An administrative staff college in education' in J. Culbertson and S. Hencley (eds), *Preparing Administrators: new perspectives*. Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Education Administration.

American Association of School Administrators (n.d.), *Guidelines for the Preparation of School Administrators*. Arlington, Va.: AASA.

Bacharach, S. B. and Lawler, E. J. (1980), *Power and Politics in Organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Barnard, C. I. (1938), *The Functions of the Executive*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Baron, G. (1975), 'Some aspects of the headmaster tradition' in V. Houghton et al. (eds), *Management in Education*, Volume 1. London: Ward Lock/Open University.

Blumberg, A. (1984), 'The craft of school administration and some other rambling thoughts', *Educational Administration Quarterly*, Vol. 20, No. 4, Fall.

Blumberg, A. and Greenfield, W. (1980), *The Effective Principal*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Bobbitt, J. F. (1913), *The Supervision of City Schools: some general principles of management applied to problems of city school systems*. Bloomington, Ill.: National Society for the Study of Education.

Bolam, R. (1986), 'The national development centre for school management training' in E. Hoyle and A. McHahon (eds), *World Yearbook of Education: 1986: the management of schools*. London: Kogan Page, pp.252-270.

Bowers, C. A. (1969), *The Progressive Educator and the Depression: the radical years*. New York: Random House.

Boyan, N. J. (1981), 'Follow the leader: commentary of research in educational administration', *Educational Researcher*, pp.6-18, February.

Bridges, E. M. (1977), 'The nature of leadership' in L. L. Cunningham and R. Nystrand (eds), *Educational Administration: the developing decades*. Berkeley, Ca.: McCutchan.

_____ (1986), *The Incompetent Teacher: the challenge and the response*. Philadelphia: Falmer Press.

Burgoyne, J. G. and Stuart, R. (1978), *Management Development: context strategies*. Aldershot: Gower.

Callahan, R. E. (1962), *Education and the Cult of Efficiency: the story of the social forces that have shaped the administration of the public schools*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Callahan, R. E. and Button, H. W. (1964), 'Historical change in the role of the man in the organization: 1865-1910' in Griffiths (ed.).

Campbell, R. F. and Newell, J. (1985), 'Administration, history of' in *International Encyclopedia of Education*, Volume 1. Oxford: Pergamon Press, pp.52-59.

Chancellor, W. E. (1904), *Our Schools: their administration and supervision*. Boston: D. C. Heath.

Coombs, P. H. (1968), *The World Educational Crisis: a systems analysis*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Cooper, B. S. and Boyd, W. L. (1987), 'The evolution of training for school administrators' in Murphy and Hallinger, pp.3-27. Also to be published in D E. Griffiths (ed), *Leaders for America's Schools*, collected papers of the National Commission on Excellence in Education Administration. Berkeley, Ca.: McCutchan, pp.251-272.

Counts, G. S. (1932), *Dare the Schools Build a New Social Order?* See Bowers, 1969.

Cremin, L. A. (1961), *The Transformation of the Schools: progressivism in American education*. New York: Alfred Knopf.

Crowson, R. L. and McPherson, R. B. (1987), 'The legacy of the theory movement: learning from the new tradition' in Murphy and Hallinger, pp.45-66.

Cuban, L. (1988), *The Managerial Imperative and the Practice of Leadership in Schools*. Albany, N.Y.: The State University of New York Press.

Cubberley, E. P. (1916), *Public School Administration*. Boston: Houghton and Mifflin.

Culbertson, J. A. (1980), 'Educational administration: where we are and where we are going' in *Canadian and Comparative Educational Administration*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia.

_____ (1981), 'Antecedents of the theory movement', *Educational Administration Quarterly*, Vol. 17, No. 1, pp.25-47, Winter.

Cunningham, L. L. and Hentges, J. T. (1982), *The American School Superintendency, 1982: a summary report*. Arlington, Va.: American Association of School Administrators.

Deal, T. E. and Kennedy, A. (1982), *Corporate Cultures: the rites and rituals of corporate life*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.

Dean, J. (1985), *Managing the Secondary Schools*. Beckenham: Croom Helm.

Department of Education and Science (1975), *Ten Good Schools: a secondary school enquiry*, HMI Matters for Discussion No. 1. London: HMSO.

_____ (1987a), *Grant Maintained Schools: consultation paper*, July.

_____ (1987b), *Financial Delegation to Schools: consultation paper*, July.

Drucker, P. F. (1973), *Management: tasks, responsibilities, practices*. New York: Harper and Row.

Duke, D. L. (1987), 'Lewis and Clark College Summer Institute for Beginning School Administrators' in Murphy and Hallinger.

Dutton, S. T. and Snedden, D. (1986), *The Administration of Public Schools in the US*. New York: Macmillam.

Eisner, E. W. (1985), *The Educational Imagination*. New York: Macmillam.

Erickson, D. A. (1979), 'Research on educational administration: the state of the art', *Educational Researcher*, Vol. 8, pp.9-14.

Everard, K. B. (1986), *Developing Management in Schools*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Fallows, J. (1985), 'The case against credentialism', *Atlantic Monthly*, pp.49-67, December.

Fiedler, F. (1973), 'The contingency model and the dynamics of the leadership process', *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, Vol. 11, pp. 60-112.

Foster, W. P. (1986), *Paradigms and Promises: new approaches to educational administration*. Buffalo, N.Y.: Prometheus Books.

Getzels, J. W. and Guba, E. G. (1957), 'Social behavior and the school administrative process', *School Review*, Vol. 65, pp.423-41.

Getzels, J. W., Lipham, J. M. and Campbell, R. F. (1968), *Educational Administration as a Social Process: theory, research and practice*. New York: Harper and Row.

Glatter, R. (1972), *Management Development for the Education Profession*. London: Harrap, with the Institute of Education, University of London.

Griffiths, D. E. (1957), 'Towards a theory of administrative behavior' in R. F. Campbell and R. T. Gregg (eds), *Administrative Behavior in Education*. New York: Harper.

_____ (ed.) (1964), *Behavioral Science and Educational Administration*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

_____ (1966), 'Theory in educational administration: 1966' in G. Baron, D. H. Cooper and W. G. Walker (eds), *Educational Administration: perspectives*. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Gronn, P. C. (1984), 'On studying administrators at work', *Educational Administration Quarterly*, Vol. 18, No. 4, pp.17-35.

Gulick, L. and Urwick, L. (eds) (1937), *Papers on the Science of Administration*. New York: Institute of Public Administration, Columbia University.

Hall, W., Mackay, H. and Morgan, C. (1986), *Headteachers at work*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Halpin, A. W. (1966), *Theory and Research in Administration*. New York: Macmillan.

Hegarty, S. (ed.) (1983), *Training for Management in Schools*. Windsor: NFER-Nelson.

Hendy, J. (1987), 'Week by week', *Education*, Vol. 140, No. 14, p.267, 2 October.

Hersey, P. and Blanchard, K. H. (1977), *Management of Organizational Behavior*, 3rd edn. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall.

_____ (1982), *Management of Organization Behavior*, 4th edn. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall.

Hodgkinson, C. (1983), *The Philosophy of Leadership*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Hoyle, E. (1986), *The Politics of School Management*. Sevenoaks: Hodder and Stoughton.

Hoyle, J. R. (1985), 'Programmes in educational administration and the ASSA preparation guidelines', *Educational Administration Quarterly*, Vol. 12, No. 1, pp.71-93, Winter.

Hughes, M. G. (1975), 'The professional administrator: the case of the secondary school head' in V. Houghton et al., *Management in Educations*, Vol. 1. London: Ward Lock/Open University.

_____ (1985), 'Theory and practice in educational management' in M. Hughes, P. Ribbins and H. Thomas (eds), *Managing Education: the system and the institution*. Eastbourne: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Hughes, M. G., Carter, J. and Fidler, B. (1981), 'Professional development provision for senior staff in schools and colleges', *Report*. Birmingham: Department of Social and Administrative Studies in Education, University of Birmingham.

Jackson, A. (n.d.), *Heading for What?* Leeds: Counselling and Career Development Unit, University of Leeds.

Leithwood, K. A., Rutherford, W. and Van Der Vegt, R. (1987), *Preparing School Leaders for Educational Improvement*. Beckenham: Croom Helm.

Levine, S. L., Barth, R. and Haskins, K. W. (1987), 'The Harvard Principals' Center: school leaders as adult learners' in Murphy and Hallinger.

Lieberman, M. (1985), 'Educational specialty boards: a way out of the merit pay morass?', *Phi Delta Kappan*, pp.103-107, October.

Lindblom, C. E. (1959), 'The science of "muddling through"', *Public Administration Review*, Vol. 19, pp.79-99.

Lyons, G. (1974), *The Administrative Tasks of Head and Senior Teachers in Large Secondary Schools*. Bristol: University of Bristol.

McPhee, J. (1967), *The Headmaster*. New York: Four Winds Press.

McPherson, R. B., Crowson, R. L. and Pitner, N. J. (1986), *Managing Uncertainty: organizational theory and practice in educational administration*. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill.

Mann, D. (1975), 'What peculiarities in education make it difficult to profess: an essay', *Journal of Educational Administration*, Vol. 13, No. 1, pp.141-156, May.

March, J. G. and Simon, H. A. (1958), *Organizations*. New York: Wiley.

Mintzberg, H. (1973), *The Nature of Managerial Work*. New York: Harper and Row.

Morris, Van C. et al. (1984), *Principals in Action: the reality of managing schools*. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill.

Moyle, C., Andrews, R. J. and Keith, C. (1987), 'The Institute of Educational Administration in Australia' in Murphy and Hallinger.

Murphy, J. and Hallinger, P. (1987) (eds), *Approaches to Administrator Training in Education*. Albany, N. Y.: State University of New York Press.

National Development Centre (1987), *The National Development Centre: progress and prospect*. Bristol: NDC for School Management Training.

Newby, M. (1987), 'Implications of GRIST', *Newsletter*, No. 9, p.2, Spring.

Nunnery, M. Y. (1982), 'Reform of K-12 administrator preparation — some basic questions', *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, Vol. 15, No. 2 pp.44-51.

Payne, W. H. (1875), *Chapters in School Supervision*. Cincinnati: Wilson, Himble and Co.

Pennington, R. C. and Bell, G. H. (1983), 'Headteacher education and training in England', *Collected Original Resources in Education* (CORE), Vol. 7, No. 2.

Peterson, K. D. and Finn, C. E., Jr. (1985), 'Principals, superintendents and the administrator's art', *The Public Interest*, No. 79, pp.42-62, Spring.

Pfeffer, J. and Salancik, G. R. (1983), 'Organizational design: the case for a coalition model of organizations' in J. R. Hackman, E. E. Lawler and L. W. Porter (eds), *Perspectives on Behavior in Organizations*. New York: McGraw Hill, pp.102-111.

Pitner, N. J. (1987), 'School administrator preparation in the U.S.' in Leithwood, Rutherford and Van Der Vegt, pp.55-106.

Poster, C. (1987), 'School management training in the UK' in Leithwood, Rutherford and Van Der Vegt, pp.37-54.

Ravitch, D. (1974), *The Great School Wars*. New York: Basic Books.

Roethlisberger, F. J. and Dickson, W. J. (1939), *Management and the Worker*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Rogers, D. (1964), *110 Livingston Street*. New York: Random House.

Sayer, J. (1985), *What Future for Secondary Schools?* Basingstoke: Falmer Press.

Schön, D. A. (1983), *The Reflective Practitioner*. New York: Basic Books.

_____ (1984), 'Leadership as reflection-in-action' in Sergiovanni and Corbally, pp.36-63.

Sergiovanni, T. J. and Corbally, J. E. (eds) (1984), *Leadership and Organizational Culture: new perspectives on administrative theory and practice*. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press.

Sexton, S. (1987), *Our Schools: a radical policy*. London: Institute of Economic Affairs, Education Unit.

Silver, P. and Spuck, D. W. (1978), *Preparation Programmes for Educational Administrators in the US*. Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration.

Simon, H. A. (1947), *Administrative Behavior: a study of the decision-making process in administrative organizations*. New York: The Free Press.

Spaulding, F. E. (1910), *The Aims, Scope and Methods of a University Course in Public School Administration*. Iowa City, Iowa: National Society for College Teachers of Education.

_____ (1913), 'Improving school systems through scientific management', *Proceedings of the Department of Superintendence, National Education Association, 1913*. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, pp.249-279.

Squire, W. H. (1987), *Educational Management in the UK: a defective model and its remedies*. Aldershot: Gower.

Strayer, G. D. et al. (1916), *Public School Administration*. Boston: Houghton and Mifflin.

Taylor, F. W. (1974), *Scientific Management*. New York: Harper and Row.

Van Der Perre, C. and Vandenberghe, R. (1987), 'Training programmes for school leaders in Europe' in Leithwood, Rutherford and Van Der Vegt.

Weindling, D. and Earley, P. (1987), *Secondary Headship: the first years*. Windsor: NFER-Nelson.

Wolcott, H. (1973), *The Man in the Principal's Office*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

FORUM

for the discussion of new trends in education

FORUM, founded in 1958, is an independent journal addressed to progressive classroom teachers, heads and administrators, as well as to parents interested in understanding more about new developments and trends in education.

FORUM is run by teachers: the editorial board is drawn from infant, junior and comprehensive schools, adult and community education, administration and teacher education. It is an entirely independent journal, having no connection with any established organization or institution.

FORUM keeps close to the classroom, but it is also alive to the issues behind the news and behind new developments in education. It has been in the forefront of the move towards comprehensive education and towards mixed ability grouping in primary and secondary schools — trends which FORUM pioneered.

Articles regularly discuss the content and methods of education: new teaching methods, classroom organization, curriculum, multicultural education, assessment, profiles, classroom and school management. Government policy is regularly analysed and assessed.

Publication dates: September, January, May.

Subscription to FORUM (£5.00 p.a.) to:
The Business Manager, FORUM, 7 Bollington Road,
Oadby, Leicester, LE2 4ND

BEDFORD WAY PAPERS

educational studies and related areas

REDEFINING THE COMPREHENSIVE EXPERIENCE (BWP 32)

Clyde Chitty (ed.)

The 'comprehensive revolution' was launched some twenty years ago with a variety of objectives, including the provision of a school system that would be both more efficient and just in developing the abilities of *all* pupils. Today, more than 90 per cent of British pupils attend secondary schools of a non-selective nature. Yet public confidence in the comprehensive system is being undermined. The present Education Secretary regards it as 'seriously flawed' and, along with other educational issues, it was a key point of discussion in the 1987 general election campaign. A Conservative Government has been returned determined to introduce radical changes. What future remains for the comprehensive experience?

The contributors to this Bedford Way Paper are all committed to a belief in this experience — though it needs to be redefined in terms of the current situation and needs. In far too many cases achievement within an academic curriculum stemming from the grammar school has been the only kind which counted. But the 'new vocationalism' is being introduced in a manner that could bring a similar narrowing of education and exclusion. The volume argues for a curriculum that synthesizes the academic and the vocational and protects a broad educational experience for all, and for a variety of organizational forms within the comprehensive framework. That framework remains the best hope for all the nation's children.

BEDFORD WAY PAPERS

educational studies and related areas

THE GCSE: AN UNCOMMON EXAMINATION (BWP 29)

Caroline Gipps (ed.)

The establishment of the General Certificate of Secondary Education (GCSE) has been described as one of the most significant educational innovations of the past half century. The authors of this Bedford Way Paper set out the background to the introduction of the new examination and discuss the issues and problems to which it gives rise.

Among major issues discussed are the question of whether the aim of a common examination at 16-plus will be subverted through the presence of differentiated papers and questions; the problems associated with including course work within the assessment; questions posed by the extension of assessment by teachers; whether it will be possible successfully to employ grade criteria; and the role of and thinking behind GCSE within the total context of assessment at secondary level. Concerns highlighted include whether the new examination will lead to an enhanced professional role for teachers and whether it will succeed in the end in permitting a greater range of pupil ability to be assessed.

The volume is published in the belief that a full debate of the issue of assessment and its relationship to the curriculum and pedagogy of the secondary school is all important at this fledgling stage of the new examination.

BEDFORD WAY PAPERS

educational studies and related areas

EDUCATION FOR A PLURALIST SOCIETY (BWP 30)

Graham Haydon (ed.)

The Swann Report, *Education for All* (published in 1985), presents the response of an official inquiry to a profoundly important question as we move towards the last decade of the present century: how should education respond to the diversity of culture, faith and ethnic background which characterizes present-day British society?

The chapters collected in this volume are by philosophers of education who, from the perspective of their discipline, attempt to explore further some of the reflections and conclusions of the Swann Report. Two of the contributors discuss what the 'framework of commonly accepted values' for which the report calls might consist of, and how it might be arrived at; another probes more deeply into the notion of prejudice; another looks at the question of racism and self-esteem among pupils; two others contend that there is more to be said than Swann recognizes for separate religious schools of a certain kind within the maintained system, and for positive discrimination in the appointment of ethnic minority teachers.

Given the complexity and importance of the subject it is not surprising that the contributors fail to agree with one another on all points. But there is a common recognition that the school and teachers have a crucial role to play in any movement towards a genuinely pluralist society. The volume should be seen as a contribution to a debate of momentous import; each of its chapters sketches a possibility or a line of argument that demands to be taken seriously.

The daily life of the English headteacher and of other school senior staff in the 1990s will be very different from that of their predecessors a generation earlier. Increasingly, financial and entrepreneurial skills will be required of them. It will no longer be safe to assume (if it ever was) that those who are good teachers will automatically become good heads. The Education Reform Act of 1988, in devolving financial and management responsibilities to schools, will call for the selection of headteachers and others in senior management positions, and the training given to them, to be far more carefully planned and systematically structured than has been the case up to now.

The present piecemeal approach to headteacher selection and training (and the emphasis in funding policy on the short, practical skill, courses) contrasts markedly with the situation in the United States. American teachers decide early on in their careers whether they wish to follow a managerial or a teaching career; school management there is a separate profession with its own rigorous training courses and legally required credentials. Is this the way which Britain should now go?

In this Bedford Way Paper, two American academics, Bruce Cooper and Wayne Shute, argue that the time is ripe for such a development. In a critical examination of the American system of training and certification they suggest some key features which Britain might usefully adopt and others where, starting afresh, it might improve on the inflexibilities of US policies. Their argument deserves serious consideration by policy makers and educational administrators at this critical juncture in the development of our schools and the professional needs of the people who run them.